

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:55:16 AM

---

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

Greetings:

The consultants indicated that Administration should be able to provide the industrial capacity studies they used in developing the Municipal Development Plan. Could these please be posted on the RVC website asap. It is highly questionable that Admin and the consultants had access to information that was not available to residents during the consultations for this plan.

Thank you  
Janet Ballantyne

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020 - Municipal Development Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:12:29 AM

---

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

Comment regarding reviewing country residential development land use specifically in ASP reviews

- why single out this one land use?
- there should be a need to provide a market analysis to determine whether any specific land use is not selling because of its own characteristics or because of general market conditions

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - BYLAW C-8090-2020 New MDP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:44:24 PM

---

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

In the proposed MDP on pages 26 & 27 of 72 in sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 there is reference to a specific parcel size of 4 hectares (9.9 acres). There are areas of Rocky View County where 8 hectares (20 acres) would be a much better parcel size to utilize here.

*There were numerous problems with FREEZING of the transmission of the video feed and a person misses hearing what is said while trying to get back into the video. Portions of some of the video presentations were missed and there will be a need to review the video once it is posted to get the full intent of the presentations.*

J.F. (Jim) Chmilar, P.Eng.FNACE

Rocky View County T4C 2W1

Lot 1 Block 3 NW/17/28/05/05

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Support for recommended motions for MDP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:05:04 PM  
**Attachments:** [clip\\_image001.png](#)

---

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

We would like to thank the Rockyview Council for all your efforts to benefit Rockyview County and its residents. We would also like to express our strong support for the following motions submitted by our Rockyview County neighbor, Ann McNabb.

**Re: Rocky View MDP Plan for next 20 years Motion for 1A and Section 3.3 Performance Contract**

**Reeve and Council thank you for all your efforts to make Rocky View great!**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council add to Figure 2 and 3 the 1A corridor west of Cochrane as a growth corridor for residential and business and be planned.

**Justification:** This 1A area is being impacted by the huge expansion of the Burnco gravel pit, which has now been submitted to RV June 1, 2020. This has a huge cumulative impact for 6-7 km on the Bow River Valley, the regional water supply for over 2-3 million people for potentially up to 150 years given current market history. About 10 quarter sections or about 1200 acres of the Bow River Valley will be impacted: the equivalent of several gravel pits for the next 30-150 plus years. This is not a temporary use. See Figure Burnco pit phases.

If the Figures 2 and 3 are not revised in the MDP, then no aggregate resource approval should occur that doesn't develop an Area Structure plan first and have specific time limits. The RV MDP should not allow the Bow River to convert to compatible industrial uses as per the Aggregate resource policy 3.3 states.

### **Section 3.3 Natural Resource Extraction:**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council include performance criteria and social contract:

- Gravel pits (transitional use) and land use changes should be permitted and approved for an area for 10-year periods from site preparation to reclamation. Plan the area to establish potential final use. Ensure an Area Structure plan is developed first.
- Establish environment performance monitoring visible to owners and adjacent owners for: water, air, dust, noise. Use standards compatible with rural country residential. (Not city night standards). Leaving standards to Alberta Environment or others does not currently allow Rocky View neighbours' input into the process that can seriously impact adjacent landowners.
- Scope change to involve the public and nonperformance of the social contract to cause review and termination if not corrected.

**Justification:** *Policy states “The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County is an important contributor to the local economy. However, resource extraction can also significantly impact adjacent land uses and the natural environment, requiring careful consideration for how extraction is planned and implemented. ... should minimize impacts on surrounding land uses.”*

RV MDP and the proactive planning of the area is the forum to “develop mutually agreeable solutions”. Without proactively planning the 1A corridor west of Cochrane, how can the highest and best use for the area be determined without impacting the adjacent landowners, the environment and the critical water supply for the Calgary and areas downstream.?

These policies of resource extraction sterilize and eliminate the highest and best value of the land. Who is paying for the neighbour impact? The Pits are not temporary if the plans extend beyond 5-10 years! Land use beyond 10 years is unrealistic and unjustifiable.

At the February 2, 2021 public hearing for the Lehigh Hanson aggregate pit, Rocky View Councillors stated that the Bearspaw ASP should have been updated to allow planning for the highest and best use. Councillors agreed heavy industrial (aggregate) is not compatible with country residential. Lehigh Hanson proposal for 25 years is a lifetime for most residences and one Councillor said for them.

### **Burnco 6-7km Cochrane West phases.**

2011 RV approved Phase A1-A5 and A7 as the applicant stated the pit would last as a 10-year pit. Now 10 years later

the gravel pit is still working on phase A1 and has huge mountains of gravel. Applicant stated that the current market is 100,000 to 150,000 tons /year. Given the 15 million tons, the proposed gravel pit may last 150 years.

Reg Storms and Kathleen Cornish



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:18:52 AM  
**Attachments:** [Email submissions MDP 2021.docx](#)

---

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

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Lori-ann Esser. I live at 40 Church Ranches Boulevard, T3R 1C1, in Rocky View County. I had intended to provide written submissions to Rocky View County Council regarding opposition to Bylaw C-8090-2020 but given that I also was involved in the hearing for the Scott Property applications, I was unable to complete my written comments on the MDP by the deadline of February 3, 2021. I have submitted a video regarding Bylaw C-8090-2020, but because of the time limit I was not able to provide the full response I had intended. I am hoping that Council will accept the more detailed submission in opposition to Bylaw C-8090-2020 attached to this email.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lori-ann Esser

Lori-ann Esser  
40 Church Ranches Blvd.  
Rocky View County, AB T3R 1C1

---

February 16, 2021

Rocky View County Council  
Attention: Reeve Daniel Henn  
Rocky View County  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

VIA E-MAIL: [publichearings@rockyview.ca](mailto:publichearings@rockyview.ca)

**Regarding: Opposition to Bylaw C-8090-2020, Municipal Development Plan**

Dear Reeve Henn, Deputy Reeve McKylor and Councillors:

My name is Lori-ann Esser. As a resident of Rocky View County, I am providing comments opposing Bylaw C-8090-2020, the proposed Municipal Development Plan, as it is currently drafted.

First, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to address Council on the matter of the proposed Municipal Development Plan (MDP.)

Second, I want to thank you, as Council, and the Rocky View County staff, for the work that you do serving the community and for the efforts you made to draft this MDP and get it to this stage. Having worked in Public Service for most of my career, I know that it is an important, yet sometimes thankless, job. In my former career, I practiced as a lawyer in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Alberta. I was involved in statutory interpretation and drafting and analyzing many documents. I am aware of how much work goes into them. I also am aware that inadequate drafting of a statutory instrument can cause a whole lot of headaches for legislators and those trying to make sense of, and apply, that legislation down the road.

**Context**

My family is grateful to be living in Rocky View County and we enjoy and appreciate all that it has to offer. Originally coming from another province, we are happy to call Alberta, and specifically Rocky View County, home. We were very intentional in choosing to live here. We love our community and the many friends, neighbours, and acquaintances whom we have met. Rocky View County has been a safe haven for my family. Maintaining the rural character of this area is a priority for us and I expect for

many others in my immediate neighbourhood and the broader community of Rocky View County. As such, my concerns with respect to the MDP are related to preserving the rural nature of our area and avoiding concentrated high-density housing; protecting residential communities from incompatible industrial developments (particularly aggregate extraction and related industries); protecting agricultural land; solidifying accountable, orderly, good land-use planning; protecting the natural environment and wildlife; and encouraging the development and enhancement of natural recreation areas for people to enjoy such as accessible walking trails, ski trails and parks.

There are too many aspects to cover in just a few pages, and I respect the time that Council must take to review all of the written submissions, video submissions and the emails sent during the hearing. So I defer to many of the written submissions to Council that discuss residential density concerns and the use of ambiguous language such as using the permissive word “should” in many instances where the mandatory “shall” would offer more protection and clearer guidance. For my part, I will focus on the protection of residential communities and the neighbouring natural environment from industrial development, particularly aggregate extraction. I will refer to some of the issues that came up during the Scott Property hearing on February 2 and 3, 2021. I do not do so to rehash any of that hearing, but to illustrate and to give context to what I consider deficiencies in the MDP as it is currently drafted.

Council saw during the Scott property hearing that there was an outpouring of emotion from those who felt that their health, safety, homes and property were threatened by the possibility of a gravel pit being established in and near their neighbourhoods. Having a safe, protected home environment is of great importance to the people who invested in, and who live in, Bearspaw. I have no doubt that people living in other parts of Rocky View County are equally passionate about protecting their health, homes, properties and agricultural pursuits. This has become even more pronounced as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. This is what I have in mind when responding to the draft MDP. As I noted in submissions to Council for the Scott Property hearing, I know that gravel is needed for infrastructure and can provide employment to Albertans. My concern is to ensure that County bylaws and plans provide clear guidance on when and where gravel extraction is acceptable, and to take every necessary measure to protect Rocky View County residents from unnecessary harm.

### **Limitations**

My comments have to be general, as the deadline for written submissions for the MDP coincided with the Scott Property hearing. As I was very much engaged in that hearing, I was unable to give my full attention to the MDP. Neither did I have the opportunity for an in-depth comparison of the current County Plan with the proposed MDP. Based on a cursory review, it seems that the County Plan is a much more detailed document and I am unclear as to why it needs full replacement rather than being amended as was done in 2018. I rely on the fuller analysis that other people

have taken the time to do and who have provided their thoughts on the differences between them through written submissions to Council on this matter.

I do not feel that I was adequately contacted for feedback on the MDP prior to this last draft and hearing. My husband and I both submitted an online survey, with the confines that come with the manner of the questions asked and the available answers. This is all of the contact that I had with the County about the MDP. Perhaps there were other opportunities for more in-depth discussion at some of the public engagements, but I was unable to take advantage of them at the time. The current restrictions related to the Covid-19 pandemic have further impacted the ability for people to engage in this process as they might otherwise have done. I question whether there has been adequate means for providing full feedback.

### **Analysis of certain paragraphs of the MDP**

#### **Paragraph 2.3.1**

Paragraph 2.3.1 of the MDP, under the heading “Residential Development,” states that, “Primary residential areas comprise lands where residential development and ancillary commercial and light industrial development will be the predominant land use.” In my opinion, “industrial,” light or otherwise, is not ancillary to residential land use and “appropriate commercial development” also may not be, depending on what that commercial development is. As it stands, neither “light industrial” nor “commercial development” is defined within the body of the MDP or in the glossary. This paragraph needs to be redrafted to better reflect what a primary residential area truly is for your constituents.

Example redrafting one: “Primary residential areas comprise lands where residential development will be the predominant land use.”

Example redrafting two: “Primary residential areas comprise lands where residential development and complementary commercial development will be the predominant land uses.” This would need a corresponding definition of suitable “complementary commercial development” for clarity.

#### **Paragraph 2.4.2**

Similar to the above, paragraph 2.4.2 states that “commercial and light industrial development in appropriate locations contributes to the viability of Primary Residential Areas by providing social and community meeting places, enabling employment and offering goods and services.” I am having a hard time picturing what “light industrial developments” constitute “social and community meeting places.” On their face, “commercial and light industrial developments” are not commensurate with Primary Residential Areas. This leaves residents vulnerable to interpretations and applications of this paragraph that potentially allow for developments that are incompatible with a residential area. “Commercial and light industrial developments”

are best left to the “Employment Areas” section. At the very least, the MDP needs to provide guidance as to what “commercial and light industrial development” means.

### **Paragraph 3.3**

In the introductory paragraph for Natural Resource Development, paragraph 3.3 states that, “The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County is an important contributor to the local economy.” This is a misnomer, at least insofar as gravel extraction is concerned. I refer Council back to Dr. Matthew Ayres’ expert report dated December 6, 2020, submitted by John Weatherill during the Scott Property hearings. For reference, that report is found at p. 655 in the first appendix attached to that hearing agenda. That report called into question, if not completely discredited, the actual economic benefit that would come to Rocky View County as a result of a gravel mining operation, at least one established close to a residential neighbourhood. Paragraph 3.3 needs to better reflect this reality.

Example redrafting one: “The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County may be a minor contributor to the local economy.”

Example redrafting two: “The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County may be a possible contributor to the local economy.”

Example redrafting three: “The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County may be a contributor to the local economy.”

### **Paragraph 3.3.1**

I would like to recount a comment a councillor made during the Scott Property hearing. Up front, I want to apologize if I am mistaken in my recollection of who made the comment or if my paraphrase does not reflect the councillor’s intention. Part of my uncertainty is because on my computer, it was sometimes hard to see or hear who was speaking. That said, I believe that during the Scott property hearing, Councillor Boehlke made the comment that by opposing the Scott property applications, the people in Bearspaw were pawning off the problem on other people in Rocky View County. That was neither my intention nor, to my knowledge, the intention of any member of my community who opposed those applications. But the comment does highlight the concern and the need for the MDP to be clear about gravel extraction near any residential community no matter where they may be in the County. The MDP as drafted does not achieve this. This is particularly important given that there is no separate policy to govern aggregate extractions in the County.

I urge Council to revisit subparagraphs 3.3.1 (a), (b), (c), (f), (g) and (h) of the MDP. These paragraphs need to provide better standards and guidance for the protection of your constituents and to standardize where and when gravel extraction is appropriate and acceptable.

### **3.3.1(a)**

In subparagraph (a) the word “minimize” in front of “adverse impacts” should be changed to “avoid.” Residents should not be exposed to any unnecessary risk.

Example redrafting: “Avoid the adverse impact of aggregate resource extraction on existing residents, adjacent land uses, and the environment.”

### **3.3.1(b)**

In subparagraph (b), “collaboration” between the County, aggregate industries, residents and landowners must include the requirement for County administration to consider the submissions of respondent residents and their related expert reports in opposition to any application for a gravel pit. Similarly, expert reports and studies that an applicant submits in relation to seeking County’s approval for a gravel pit operation should be made available to the public well in advance of the related hearing such that residents have the time and opportunity to absorb the information and provide appropriate response. Only then can there be true “collaboration.”

As above, the word “mitigation” in this subparagraph is not strong enough to protect constituents. The impact of extraction activities on nearby residents needs to be nothing less than “avoided.”

Example redrafting: “Encourage collaboration between the County, the aggregate extraction industry, and impacted residents and landowners to develop mutually agreeable solutions that avoid and negate impacts of extraction activities.”

Add: Requirements for disclosure of applicant materials to the public within a generous time frame to allow for appropriate response.

Add: Requirements for County staff to consider respondent materials and expert reports when drafting a recommendation to Council.

### **3.3.1(c)**

Subparagraph (c) must include a parallel guideline that aggregate extraction should not only be discouraged, but also prohibited, near current and planned residential developments.

Example drafting one: Add “Prohibit aggregate extraction and related industrial uses that may impact current and planned residential development.”

Example drafting two: Add “Discourage aggregate extraction and related industrial uses that may impact current and planned residential development.”

### **3.3.1(f)**

Subparagraph 3.3.1(f) refers to the necessity for a Master Site Development Plan (MSDP.) This is good, except that what is in the draft MDP does not go far enough to legislate the requirements for the MSDP. During the Scott Property hearings, we heard about the many aspects of life, health and the environment that can be impacted by a gravel pit. The MDP should not be decreasing the requirement for a complete and detailed MSDP for these types of applications. In fact, it should be maintaining or, better yet, bolstering it. At the very least, the appendices included in the current County Plan should be included in the MDP, if not supplemented. Council should consider the requirement that, where appropriate, applicants provide a detailed and definitive reclamation plan as part of an MSDP.

In addition, the MDP should provide that where in-house expertise is not available to County staff, they should be required to engage independent experts to advise Council on technical matters that arise from an applicant's MSDP and make these reports available to the public well in advance of any hearing.

Similarly, as noted above, applicant materials, including expert reports and studies that are submitted to Council as part of a MSDP, must be disclosed to residents/respondents well in advance of a hearing to allow for appropriate review of, and response to, the applicant's materials.

Example redrafting: Add a list of reports and studies required for an MSDP.

Example redrafting: Add the requirements for Council's independent studies or reports where required for understanding technical matters outside of the expertise of County staff.

Example redrafting: Add the requirement for disclosure of applicant materials in advance of a hearing to allow for appropriate response from affected residents and landowners.

### **3.3.1(g)**

Subparagraph 3.3.1 (g) states, "Consider co-locating other complementary industrial uses adjacent to aggregate extraction sites." This subparagraph needs to give better guidance as to what is an appropriate "complementary" industry to gravel extraction and when and where it would be suitable to co-locate with a pit. These "complementary" industries should be subject to the same standards to protect neighbouring residential communities as do gravel extraction industries, including submitting an MSRP.

### **3.3.1(h)**

Reclamation, for example after an approved aggregate pit is exhausted, needs to be better addressed in the MDP. During the Scott Property hearing, Councillor Hanson (I

believe) asked the applicant, “How would country residential look like after mining?” The question related to the fact that the property in question was currently designated “agricultural” with future land use designated as “country residential” and would be exposed to 25-30 years of open-pit gravel mining. Tellingly, Mr. Venner’s response, on behalf of the applicant, affirmed the common-sense doubt that the land could go back to either of its originally designated uses. He began talking about the “potential for regional infrastructure uses” such as a water reservoir to help alleviate flooding in the area, or “future urban development to store raw water.” Then he said, “But we are getting ahead of ourselves,” following which he talked about working with the community for an end use like the Inland soccer pitch. Then he said that the plan was to return the land to agricultural use. This sounded doubtful, given everything else that he listed off first. He continued by talking about it as “an opportunity yet to be explored” with future councils. The non-answer was an answer. And it spoke volumes.

Council needs to protect its constituents by providing for appropriate and adequate reclamation. If reclamation cannot be achieved sufficiently, or if the proposed alternate end-purpose of an exhausted pit, for example, would be incompatible with neighbouring lands, the extraction should not be permitted.

Paragraph 3.3.1(h) needs to be made mandatory. “Supporting” reclamation, with the door wide open to considering and allowing “other industrial or complimentary uses” instead, does not sufficiently protect adjacent residents or landowners. The MDP needs to be definitive on what reclamation is and what will be acceptable reclamation. At the very least, the MDP needs to outline when, where and what other “industrial and complementary uses” would be considered.

### **Paragraph 3.5.1**

Similarly, the MDP as currently drafted doesn’t go far enough to provide for environmental protections. At the Scott Property hearing, one of the reports that the applicant submitted said something to the effect that impact on wildlife and the environment would be minimal. The report indicated that whatever wildlife was there would simply, “find somewhere else to go.” Biologist Robert Best challenged the sufficiency of the wildlife study in his report dated December 18, 2020, found at p. 621 of the first appendix to the agenda for that hearing. Even with the current requirements of an MSDP, the applicant at the Scott Property hearing completely failed to address the impact on fish. Council also knows about the conflicting reports submitted at that hearing regarding the impact of such a pit on the local aquifer.

Under paragraph 3.5.1 (a), development applications “may” require impact assessments. That language needs to be changed to the imperative and should be bolstered by an extensive and exhaustive list of what reports and studies are mandatory for any development application to be considered, let alone accepted and approved.

Example redrafting: “Where development is proposed near potential *Ecological Features*...development applications must require the preparation and implementation of a bio-physical impact assessment to identify potential negative impacts and mitigation measures.”

**Additional drafting:**

I realize that there may be interplay with provincial legislation, but to the extent that it has jurisdiction to do so, Council should include wording in the MDP to prevent multiple applications for aggregate extraction for the same property. Once Council has decided that a property is inappropriate for aggregate extraction because it is incompatible with nearby residential developments, future applications for any similar type of extraction on the same property should be prohibited so that residents can be assured and confident that Council’s decisions won’t be open to being revisited or changed every few years.

**Conclusion**

As currently worded, the proposed MDP does not go far enough to provide for accountable, orderly, good land-use planning and protection of current residents and landowners. It seems to reduce restrictions that are in place to protect residential communities from industrial development and, instead, leaves “appropriate development” open to interpretation and potentially incompatible and inconsistent results. There are fewer rules and oversight through this MDP, which may lead to poor development choices and no way for residents, landowners and other affected parties to respond. In terms of replacing the current County Plan, sometimes less is less.

The use of permissive language in many parts of the MDP may seem useful for giving Council greater leeway in making decisions. In my experience, however, the use of ambiguous language leads to misinterpretation, misapplication and unintended or inconsistent results. Tightening up the language in the MDP will reduce and avoid difficulties of statutory interpretation for future Councils, constituents and other interested parties for years to come.

I suggest that more drafting can be done to ensure residents, landowners and their interests are protected; to assist in maintaining the rural nature of the County; to achieve better protection of agricultural pursuits; and to better protect and maintain the natural environment, including wetlands and wildlife. More work on this document will help provide the necessary framework and tools that will lead to sound land-use planning and County development that can continue for years to come. In turn, Rocky View County will continue to be the beautiful, dynamic and thriving place that we call home.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori-ann Esser

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:10:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [Video script MDP draft.docx](#)

---

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

## **APPENDIX for C-8090-2020 from Keren Farquharson (SE 36-28-4-W5) representing Farquharson Farms**

The following details coincide with previous points in my video presentation and provide clarification and edits.

*Text in italics is script from the draft. Red are additions. Black are edits to existing text.*

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]--> Vision:

*Set within a cherished natural landscape, Rocky View County is a flourishing municipality that provides a high quality of life, guided by its rural heritage, **balances agriculture with** a diversity of residential and economic opportunities, and sustainable development.*

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->In 1.4 Rocky View County Context on page 5, there is no mention of the vast mixed farming areas that lie between the west country and the eastern side of the County. The central area of RVC is not represented.

*In the County's western reaches, coniferous forests of the Rocky Mountain Foothills transition to rolling hills scattered with ranches. Moving eastward, the foothills give way to prairie grasslands and wetlands **with the central area predominantly mixed agricultural operations.** Eastern Rocky View County is dominated with agricultural operations, including the production of hay, cereal and oilseed crops. Large scale ranching, logging, and oil and gas extraction are major industries in western Rocky View County **while mixed farming, ranching, equestrian and shale gas development are dominate in the central area, and while shale gas development, ranching, equestrian** livestock operations, conventional agricultural operations, and diversified agriculture, including greenhouses and nurseries, are prominent in eastern areas of the County.*

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->Regarding Growth map: Figure 2. The map labelling/coding needs redoing to be inclusive. Agricultural (mixed farm and ranch lands) and resource areas (aggregate; timber) need to be identified in planning suitable growth. Overlays or more maps are needed.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->The definition of 'ecology' is: "the study of relationships between living organisms, including humans and their living environment; it seeks to understand the vital connections between plants and animals and the world around them". The 'Ecological Features' description on page 15 groups 'valuable agricultural soils' into ecological features with wetlands, riparian areas and wildlife categories and makes no sense. What has been included in ecological features does not fit with the definition of ecology. This needs to go back to the drawing board. New categories need to be developed and coded separately: **i) Environmentally Significant Areas (wetlands; riparian areas; wildlife corridors); ii) Agriculturally Significant Areas (grasslands; field crops); and iii) Resource Significant Areas (aggregate, timber, oil & gas).**

5. <!--[endif]-->The County must be more aware of the land potential within its own boundaries because not all data from other sources is accurate, but it is used by the County. The Government of Canada Land Capability for Agriculture (Canada Land Inventory) classifies much of our area land in our westerly NC region as 4 H,T. This means:

4= severe limitations that restrict the range of crops or require conservation practice

H = temperature (early frosts)

T = adverse topography (steep terrain)

This suggests our lands are not valuable productive agricultural lands. However, on these 4H,T fields my

(late) Dad, brother and his sons grow successful hay crops, cereal and oil seed crops with high yields using select grain seed varieties that require a shorter growing season and mature early. With 26%-73% hail this year my barley crop still came in over 60 bushels/acre. We would not be successful farmers if our lands were non-productive. The remainder of our lands that are not suitable for crop production are ideal for grazing our cattle, thus mixed farming. These lands must be recognized for their best use of land as agricultural production, be protected from other development and coded on County maps accurately.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->and 7.

#### Page 11 - 2.2 Growth Areas

b) New development ~~may occur~~ **shall be discouraged** outside of the identified priority growth areas, however, **may be considered with public consultation and surrounding neighbor support**, Council review and approval. The map also highlights the presence of ~~ecological features~~ **environmental features, agricultural areas, and natural resource areas** that warrant further study when development is proposed in these growth areas.-(see 4 above)

(see 4 above, then rewrite)

OR

b) New development **that is compatible with surrounding land uses, preserves agricultural land, and is suitable in size, scope and scale** may occur outside of the identified priority growth areas, however, with **public consultation and surrounding neighbor support**, Council review and approval. The map also highlights the presence of ~~ecological features~~ **environmentally significant areas, agricultural areas, and natural resource areas** that warrant further study when development is proposed in these growth areas.-(see 4 above)

Since opponents cannot Appeal a Redesignation, then there must be clear direction for Council and Development Authority as well as applicants.

Page 17 – 2.3.1 Primary Residential Areas comprise lands where residential development and ancillary commercial and industrial development will be the predominant land use..... When including Hamlet Growth Areas, most of the residential growth within the County over the next 20 years will be directed to Primary Residential Areas.

b) New development ~~may occur~~ **shall be discouraged** outside of identified priority growth areas: ~~with Council review and approval.~~

#### Page 19 - 2.3.2 Country Residential Development

The introduction to this 2.3.2 section is not clear. It reads that country residential communities only occur within Primary Residential Areas.

There is no definition in the Glossary for either 'Primary Residential Areas' or 'Country Residential Communities'.

2.3.2 Country Residential Development. The County has a number of country residential communities **outside of and** within Primary Residential Areas, some formally defined by area structure plans while others have grown organically over time. Country residential communities provide a unique lifestyle that many people desire, but additional growth in these areas ~~shall~~ **should** be considered through the lens of long-term fiscal sustainability for the County **and preservation of agricultural land**.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->b) <!--[endif]-->Where residential development with two or more dwelling units and greater than 4 hectares (9.9 acres) is proposed, but there is no existing area structure plan or conceptual scheme that includes the development area, an area structure plan or conceptual scheme should be adopted **at the expense of the applicant**. When determining whether an area structure plan or conceptual scheme is appropriate, Council **shall** ~~should~~ give consideration to:  
**Location, Preservation of agricultural lands and resources** • Number of units proposed; • Intensity of the proposed development; • Relationship of the proposed development to surrounding

land uses; • How the proposed development may impact future development of the surrounding lands; • Impact of the proposed development on County servicing and transportation infrastructure; • Impact of the proposed development on storm water management; and.....

<!--[if !supportLists]-->c) <!--[endif]-->Multiple unit country residential developments less than 4 hectares (9.9 acres), except for fragmented country residential development (refer to Section 2.3.3), should not be supported. ???

This statement is confusing needs clarification : i) It could be suggesting that only larger parcels would be acceptable for multiple development AND / OR ii) it means that lots each need to be larger than 9.9 acres to be supported.

e) iii) Where country residential development is not being achieved as expected, the County **shall** ~~should consider~~ **reduce** ~~reducing~~ the overall area dedicated to country residential development.

#### Page 26 - 2.6.1 Institutional and Community Policies

<!--[if !supportLists]-->d) <!--[endif]-->Proposals for institutional and community land uses that are not within the areas identified in Policy 2.6.1 a) **will may** be considered if the following is addressed:  
**i) Support from adjacent neighbors and residents within community ii) Preservation of agricultural land** i) Justification of the proposed location; ii) Demonstration of the benefit to the broader public; iii) Compatibility and integration with ~~existing~~-**surrounding** land uses or nearby communities; and iv) Infrastructure with the capacity to service the proposed development.

#### Page 31 - Agriculture 3.4 Objectives

The policies within the Agriculture Policy Area are to ensure the following objectives:

- The agriculture sector remains an important component of the county's economy.
- Adverse impacts on agriculture from nonagricultural land uses are minimized.
- New forms of agriculture innovation and diversification are encouraged through land use.
- **Discourage and minimize land taken out of agricultural production.**

#### Page 32/33 - 3.4.1 Agricultural Policies

<!--[if !supportLists]-->e) <!--[endif]-->Applicants proposing new residential, **recreational**, institutional, commercial, and industrial land uses shall design and implement measures to minimize their adverse impacts on existing agriculture operations, based on the County's Agriculture Boundary Design Guidelines **and**:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->i) <!--[endif]--> **undertake consultation with neighbors and /or affected community members and provide their written confirmation letters to the County with applications.**

<!--[if !supportLists]-->ii) <!--[endif]--> **support the 'Right to Farm' principles which support agricultural operators in going about their day-day business with minimum adverse impacts from non-agricultural land use.**

By adding the above, these filters this could potentially save a lot of time and cost to the County, taxpayers and affected parties. Applicants may decide to not apply if there is significant opposition from neighbors and /or community residents. However, if an application were to move forward for review, it would give the County a better understanding of potential appeals if there was significant opposition.

The video presentation is in the attachment (for reference).

Respectfully submitted, Keren Farquharson on behalf of Farquharson Farms

## **RE: Municipal Development Plan Bylaw C-8090-2020**

### **INTRODUCTION**

My name is Keren Farquharson. I am speaking on behalf of Farquharson Farms: my brother Don Farquharson and his two sons, Stacey, and Cody. We respectfully offer our comments and edits to the Draft before you, not in opposition, but to strengthen the Municipal Plan.

We farm in the (westerly) North Central area of Division 9. Our families are generational farmers in the Madden /Dog Pound/Bottrel vicinities. These rural areas are still dominantly agriculture. A few country residences dot into our landscape but unfortunately, we are witnessing our areas being threatened with other potential development that is not related to agriculture. Concentrating and directing non-agricultural development to growth areas is imperative to alleviate pressure of unfavorable development in ag communities. There are some weakness and loopholes in this draft that would not protect our farm and ranch lands from incompatible and irreversible development.

### **RATIONALE**

Adverse development (such as resorts, lodges, campsites, or subdivisions) would not be compatible with agricultural operations. They would have negative impact on farmers. Our ag livelihoods must be safeguarded with the 'right to farm principles'. The MDP along with other policies and plans are crucial to provide more definitive direction to County Planners, Councilors, developers, and applicants with unambiguous guidelines to deal with the demands of development. As RVC continues to grow it is paramount to preserve our ag lands and conserve other non-renewable resources. Once our farmlands and other natural resources are built over with development, there is no going back to growing crops, grazing livestock, excavating gravel, or harvesting timber. Growth is inevitable but **must** be directed only to growth areas. Foresight beyond the next 20 years is imperative or situations such as the Hansen gravel conflict will continue. Being proactive rather than reactive is a win-win now and for the future.

### **RECOMMENDATION OF CHANGES NEEDED IN THE DRAFT MDP**

In this new MDP there needs to be more recognition and greater significance for the retention of agricultural lands: details are missing; wording is too weak ; ag lands are not identified; the value of agriculture is not stressed enough; and there is not adequate protection for agricultural land. These source lands produce our food. I will introduce 7 points. Each of these points have further detail or edits (by cut and paste from the draft) in the Appendix which was emailed today and will assist to clarify the following points:

1. The word 'agriculture' has been removed from the 'Vision' and must be added back in.  
[See Appendix (1)]
2. In 1.4 Rocky View County Context on page 5 in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraphs, the description of the County jumps from stunning depictions of the west to picturesque explanations of the east without any mention of the vast central region in between and what it showcases. This mixed farmland agricultural area composes much of the land mass of RVC and must receive acknowledgement. [See Appendix (2)]

3. In Figure 2 Growth Map on page 14, information is incomplete and inaccurate. There is no coding for resources or agricultural land. All ag land must be identified, valued, and validated. Grouped in with 'Ecological' are 'valuable agricultural soils'. Farmland soils in our area do not fit in this 'valued soils' coded category, but we produce high yielding crops, however, are not given recognition on the map. This missing data is relevant to identify where growth is not acceptable. This opens an escape for potential incompatible development in predominantly agricultural areas. The map is inadequate and needs to be redone, with perhaps 2 or 3 layers, or more maps added. [See Appendix (3)]

4. Further to the point I just discussed, the "Ecological Features" that are coded on Figure 2 Map are described on page 15 as: *"These potentially important ecological features include wetlands, riparian areas, valuable agricultural soils, and wildlife corridors"*. This labelling and grouping in the MDP is perplexing. Where you have a wetland, you do not have valuable agricultural soils, as portrayed on the map within the same code. It would be logical to group separately: a) environmental areas b) agricultural lands; and c) resources. Each merit their own recognition and category so that growth areas are responsibly managed. [See Appendix (4)]

5. The County relies on land data rated by the Canada Land Inventory. In our area our lands are rated as 4H,T 'severe with adverse climate and topography'. This suggests there could be better use of these lands. But in fact, our lands in our area are productive ag lands. We received the Master Farm Family Award in 2005. Using other data that is misleading reinforces that the County's own mapping, data and terminology must be accurate and inclusive. When land is not recognized for its value, then redesignations, inappropriate developments, or subdivisions are hard for Development Authority or Council to refuse and opponents to challenge. [See Appendix (5)]

6. Preference would be that you would stick firmly with the growth areas identified for the next 20 years. There should be no need for new ASPs (except for the existing organic spread in rural areas). Conceptual plans outside of ASPs should not be allowed to prevent development or potential subdivisions from appearing wherever, as has happened in the past with the organic unplanned and uncontrolled spread in the rural County areas. [[See Appendix (6)]

7. If the MDP policy were more straightforward, for example, 'shall' instead of 'should'; 'discouraged' instead of 'may occur'; 'required' instead of 'recommended', there would be less risk of interpretation and that would alleviate uncertainty. Do not leave it to discretion. Provide clarity. Other statutory plans and policies exist, but in the hierarchy, the MDP provides the guidance for them. The County, both Development Authority and Council, as well as potential developers and applicants, need clearer guidelines in this MDP document. Communities and residents in our rural area need more security and less stress without the concern of the potential burden of incompatible development on our agricultural lands.

## CONCLUSION

I attended Open Houses, replied to the surveys for the MDP and the Land Use Bylaw and have followed documents revisions. I am asking that you table today's second reading, consider our comments seriously and adapt them into the document so that future growth is not based on inaccurate information, or lack of information, but instead clear direction. The foresight now in this MDP document is tomorrow's future.

Thank you for your attention and time.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - MDP Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 10:23:35 AM

---

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

Council,

I am watching the Public Hearing and contacting you regarding the introductory comments to the proposed MDP. The Planning Design speaker referred to 'Elbow Valley' as a 'hamlet' and 'hamlet growth area' when referencing Figure 2 on page 28 and later in reference to section 2.5 Hamlet Development. Elbow Valley is not a hamlet

Elbow Valley is a registered Trademark term referring to the discrete community close by and to the west of Calgary straddling Highway 8 that is managed by Elbow Valley Residents Club (EVRC). The Elbow Valley community consists of 699 homes with associated amenities and natural parkland comprising about half of the community area. Elbow Valley is fully built out.

An amendment in the recent draft removed reference to 'Elbow Valley' on Figure 2 as a hamlet. In the new draft the map and text correctly refers to 'Elbow View', which is a proposed development to the west of Elbow Valley and adjacent communities along Highway 8.

Thank you for your effective adaptation to Covid-19 in providing virtual opportunities to participate in Hearings.

Regards,

Wayne Jessee  
EVRC External Affairs Committee

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 10:31:30 AM

---

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Municipal Development Plan.

I have concerns about the weakened language regarding resource development in the County, specifically in relation to aggregate extraction operations. Aggregate deposits are prevalent throughout all parts of Rocky View County, and it is important to ensure that development and extraction is located in those areas that will:

- Avoid impact to residents
- Avoid environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide positive economic benefit to the County

Further, where aggregate development is considered, there must be clear and strict requirements to guide project proponents, County staff, and Council. I am concerned that the draft language in the MDP weakens the requirements for proponents, and indeed for future staff and Council, in regards to future developments. I urge Council to consider the following amendments to the MDP:

- Reinstate the list of technical studies required under the existing County Plan for all aggregate operations' master site development plans.
- Amend Policy 3.3.1(c) , which discourages residential development that may be impacted by future aggregate extraction, to provide parallel discouragement of future aggregate extraction in locations that may impact existing residential development.
- Remove Policies 3.3.1(g) and (h). These policies appear to prioritize industrial activity near aggregate operations, and to prioritize industrial operations as future land uses after aggregate extraction. Without clarity about which locations in the County may be appropriate for aggregate development, these policies could inadvertently encourage incompatible industrial operations adjacent to residential and/or environmentally sensitive areas in the County.

Council and County Staff should always want to make the most accurate and well-informed decision. This is particularly true for aggregate operations, which can have significant negative impacts on surrounding areas, and which operate over long time horizons. Making the most accurate decision requires sufficient technical analysis to be a) provided by the proponent on a mandatory basis and b) evaluated by experts to ensure completeness and validity.

Thank you,

John Weatherill

51 Timber Ridge Way

Rocky View County

**From:** [Division 7, Daniel Henn](#)  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] - C8090-2020 - opposed  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:42:33 PM

---

Please include in late submissions

Dan

-----Original Message-----

From: Teri Lipman [REDACTED]  
Sent: February 16, 2021 1:40 PM  
To: Municipal Council <MunicipalCouncil@rockyview.ca>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C8090-2020 - opposed

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

Dear Councillors

I am opposed to the new plan because in a word, it's very weak and I believe it is written with a bias towards supporting commercial developers and industry over residents and preservation of the environment.

Thankyou

Teri Lipman  
12 Crestview Estates  
T3R 1E1

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Recommended Motions for MDP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:30:19 PM  
**Attachments:** [clip\\_image001.png](#)

---

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

## **Rocky View MDP Plan for next 20 years Motion for 1A and Section 3.3 Performance Contract**

**Reeve and Council thank you for all your efforts to make Rocky View great!**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council add to Figure 2 and 3 the 1A corridor west of Cochrane as a growth corridor for residential and business and be planned.

**Justification:** This 1A area is being impacted by the huge expansion of the Burnco gravel pit, which has now been submitted to RV June 1, 2020. This has a huge cumulative impact for 6-7 km on the Bow River Valley, the regional water supply for over 2-3 million people for potentially up to 150 years given current market history. About 10 quarter sections or about 1200 acres of the Bow River Valley will be impacted: the equivalent of several gravel pits for the next 30-150 plus years. This is not a temporary use. See Figure Burnco pit phases.

If the Figures 2 and 3 are not revised in the MDP, then no aggregate resource approval should occur that doesn't develop an Area Structure plan first and have specific time limits. The RV MDP should not allow the Bow River to convert to compatible industrial uses as per the Aggregate resource policy 3.3 states.

### **Section 3.3 Natural Resource Extraction:**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council include performance criteria and social contract:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Gravel pits (transitional use) and land use changes should be permitted and approved for an area for 10-year periods from site preparation to reclamation. Plan the area to establish potential final use. Ensure an Area Structure plan is developed first.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Establish environment performance monitoring visible to owners and adjacent owners for: water, air, dust, noise. Use standards compatible with rural country residential. (Not city night standards). Leaving standards to Alberta Environment or others does not currently allow Rocky View neighbours' input into the process that can seriously impact adjacent landowners.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Scope change to involve the public and nonperformance of the social contract to cause review and termination if not corrected.

**Justification:** Policy states "The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County is an important contributor to the local economy. However, resource extraction can also significantly impact adjacent land uses and the natural environment, requiring careful

*consideration for how extraction is planned and implemented. ... should minimize impacts on surrounding land uses."*

RV MDP and the proactive planning of the area is the forum to *"develop mutually agreeable solutions"*. Without proactively planning the 1A corridor west of Cochrane, how can the highest and best use for the area be determined without impacting the adjacent landowners, the environment and the critical water supply for the Calgary and areas downstream.?

These policies of resource extraction sterilize and eliminate the highest and best value of the land. Who is paying for the neighbour impact? The Pits are not temporary if the plans extend beyond 5-10 years! Land use beyond 10 years is unrealistic and unjustifiable.

At the February 2, 2021 public hearing for the Lehigh Hanson aggregate pit, Rocky View Councillors stated that the Bearspaw ASP should have been updated to allow planning for the highest and best use. Councillors agreed heavy industrial (aggregate) is not compatible with country residential. Lehigh Hanson proposal for 25 years is a lifetime for most residences and one Councillor said for them.

### **Burnco 6-7km Cochrane West phases.**

2011 RV approved Phase A1-A5 and A7 as the applicant stated the pit would last as a 10-year pit. Now 10 years later the gravel pit is still working on phase A1 and has huge mountains of gravel. Applicant stated that the current market is 100,000 to 150,000 tons /year. Given the 15 million tons, the proposed gravel pit may last 150 years.

<!--[if !vml]--> <!--[endif]-->

Ann McKendrick McNabb



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020 Recommended Motions for MDP resubmitted with reference to Bylaw  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:25:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [clip\\_image001.png](#)

---

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

Previously submitted without reference to BYLAW C-8090-2020

### **Rocky View MDP Plan for next 20 years Motion for 1A and Section 3.3 Performance Contract**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council add to Figure 2 and 3 the 1A corridor west of Cochrane as a growth corridor for residential and business and be planned.

**Justification:** This 1A area is being impacted by the huge expansion of the Burnco gravel pit, which has now been submitted to RV June 1, 2020. This has a huge cumulative impact for 6-7 km on the Bow River Valley, the regional water supply for over 2-3 million people for potentially up to 150 years given current market history. About 10 quarter sections or about 1200 acres of the Bow River Valley will be impacted: the equivalent of several gravel pits for the next 30-150 plus years. This is not a temporary use. See Figure Burnco pit phases.

If the Figures 2 and 3 are not revised in the MDP, then no aggregate resource approval should occur that doesn't develop an Area Structure plan first and have specific time limits. The RV MDP should not allow the Bow River to convert to compatible industrial uses as per the Aggregate resource policy 3.3 states.

### **Section 3.3 Natural Resource Extraction:**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council include performance criteria and social contract:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Gravel pits (transitional use) and land use changes should be permitted and approved for an area for 10-year periods from site preparation to reclamation. Plan the area to establish potential final use. Ensure an Area Structure plan is developed first.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Establish environment performance monitoring visible to owners and adjacent owners for: water, air, dust, noise. Use standards compatible with rural country residential. (Not city night standards). Leaving standards to Alberta Environment or others does not currently allow Rocky View neighbours' input into the process that can seriously impact adjacent landowners.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Scope change to involve the public and nonperformance of the social contract to cause review and termination if not corrected.

**Justification:** Policy states "The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County is an important contributor to the local economy. However, resource extraction can

*also significantly impact adjacent land uses and the natural environment, requiring careful consideration for how extraction is planned and implemented. ... should minimize impacts on surrounding land uses."*

RV MDP and the proactive planning of the area is the forum to "develop mutually agreeable solutions". Without proactively planning the 1A corridor west of Cochrane, how can the highest and best use for the area be determined without impacting the adjacent landowners, the environment and the critical water supply for the Calgary and areas downstream.?

These policies of resource extraction sterilize and eliminate the highest and best value of the land. Who is paying for the neighbour impact? The Pits are not temporary if the plans extend beyond 5-10 years! Land use beyond 10 years is unrealistic and unjustifiable.

At the February 2, 2021 public hearing for the Lehigh Hanson aggregate pit, Rocky View Councillors stated that the Bearspaw ASP should have been updated to allow planning for the highest and best use. Councillors agreed heavy industrial (aggregate) is not compatible with country residential. Lehigh Hanson proposal for 25 years is a lifetime for most residences and one Councillor said for them.

## **Burnco 6-7km Cochrane West phases.**

2011 RV approved Phase A1-A5 and A7 as the applicant stated the pit would last as a 10-year pit. Now 10 years later the gravel pit is still working on phase A1 and has huge mountains of gravel. Applicant stated that the current market is 100,000 to 150,000 tons /year. Given the 15 million tons, the proposed gravel pit may last 150 years.

<!--[if !vml]--> <!--[endif]-->

On Feb 16, 2021, at 12:29 PM, Ann McNabb <[REDACTED]> wrote:

### **Rocky View MDP Plan for next 20 years Motion for 1A and Section 3.3 Performance Contract**

**Reeve and Council thank you for all your efforts to make Rocky View great!**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council add to Figure 2 and 3 the 1A corridor west of Cochrane as a growth corridor for residential and business and be planned.

**Justification:** This 1A area is being impacted by the huge expansion of the Burnco gravel pit, which has now been submitted to RV June 1, 2020. This has a

huge cumulative impact for 6-7 km on the Bow River Valley, the regional water supply for over 2-3 million people for potentially up to 150 years given current market history. About 10 quarter sections or about 1200 acres of the Bow River Valley will be impacted: the equivalent of several gravel pits for the next 30-150 plus years. This is not a temporary use. See Figure Burnco pit phases.

If the Figures 2 and 3 are not revised in the MDP, then no aggregate resource approval should occur that doesn't develop an Area Structure plan first and have specific time limits. The RV MDP should not allow the Bow River to convert to compatible industrial uses as per the Aggregate resource policy 3.3 states.

### **Section 3.3 Natural Resource Extraction:**

**Recommend motion:** Rocky View (RV) Council include performance criteria and social contract:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Gravel pits (transitional use) and land use changes should be permitted and approved for an area for 10-year periods from site preparation to reclamation. Plan the area to establish potential final use. Ensure an Area Structure plan is developed first.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Establish environment performance monitoring visible to owners and adjacent owners for: water, air, dust, noise. Use standards compatible with rural country residential. (Not city night standards). Leaving standards to Alberta Environment or others does not currently allow Rocky View neighbours' input into the process that can seriously impact adjacent landowners.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->•<!--[endif]-->Scope change to involve the public and nonperformance of the social contract to cause review and termination if not corrected.

**Justification:** Policy states *“The extraction and use of natural resources in Rocky View County is an important contributor to the local economy. However, resource extraction can also significantly impact adjacent land uses and the natural environment, requiring careful consideration for how extraction is planned and implemented. ... should minimize impacts on surrounding land uses.”*

RV MDP and the proactive planning of the area is the forum to *“develop mutually agreeable solutions”*. Without proactively planning the 1A corridor west of Cochrane, how can the highest and best use for the area be determined without impacting the adjacent landowners, the environment and the critical water supply for the Calgary and areas downstream.?

These policies of resource extraction sterilize and eliminate the highest and best value of the land. Who is paying for the neighbour impact? The Pits are not temporary if the plans extend beyond 5-10 years! Land use beyond 10 years is unrealistic and unjustifiable.

At the February 2, 2021 public hearing for the Lehigh Hanson aggregate pit,

Rocky View Councillors stated that the Bearspaw ASP should have been updated to allow planning for the highest and best use. Councillors agreed heavy industrial (aggregate) is not compatible with country residential. Lehigh Hanson proposal for 25 years is a lifetime for most residences and one Councillor said for them.

### **Burnco 6-7km Cochrane West phases.**

2011 RV approved Phase A1-A5 and A7 as the applicant stated the pit would last as a 10-year pit. Now 10 years later the gravel pit is still working on phase A1 and has huge mountains of gravel. Applicant stated that the current market is 100,000 to 150,000 tons /year. Given the 15 million tons, the proposed gravel pit may last 150 years.

<!--[if !vml]--><!--[endif]-->

Ann McKendrick McNabb



Ann McKendrick McNabb



## Karen Jiang

---

**From:** Dominic Kazmierczak  
**Sent:** February 16, 2021 1:07 PM  
**To:** Legislative Services Shared  
**Cc:** Steve Seroya  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] - MDP Public Hearing

Hi All,

Steve received this from a developer in the County. As it's suggesting amendments to the MDP, I'd suggest it's included in the public hearing emails for Council's consideration.

Thanks,  
Dom

**DOMINIC KAZMIERCZAK**  
Manager | Planning Policy

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**  
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2  
Phone: 403-520-6291  
[DKazmierczak@rockyview.ca](mailto:DKazmierczak@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://www.rockyview.ca)

This e-mail, including any attachments, may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is prohibited and unlawful. If you received this communication in error, please reply immediately to let me know and then delete this e-mail. Thank you.

---

**From:** Steve Seroya <[SSeroya@rockyview.ca](mailto:sseroya@rockyview.ca)>  
**Sent:** February 16, 2021 12:11 PM  
**To:** Dominic Kazmierczak <[DKazmierczak@rockyview.ca](mailto:DKazmierczak@rockyview.ca)>  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] - MDP Public Hearing

---

**From:** Asad Niazi <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** February 16, 2021 12:08 PM  
**To:** Steve Seroya <[SSeroya@rockyview.ca](mailto:sseroya@rockyview.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - MDP Public Hearing

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

Hello Steve ,  
Watching the MDP public hearing and noticed the following section related to our CN ASP. Interesting statement circled. RVC is investing in the utilities while stating that they may not prioritize upgrades of servicing. I feel that the statement is contrary to RVC maximizing its investments. I suggest that this statement be taken out from the MDP, could be a risk for RVC in pursuing any upgrades.

- iv) Form, quality, design, and compatibility of proposed development;
- v) Potential for enhancements to main streets, commercial areas, and community gathering places;
- vi) Provision of parks, open space, amenities, and pathway connections;
- vii) Impact on the environment and mitigation measures;
- viii) Interface design with adjacent land uses; and
- ix) Provision for future regional transit connections; and
- x) Intermunicipal collaboration on key cross-boundary concerns.

- d) Encourage a variety of housing forms to be developed in Hamlet Growth Areas in order to provide a range of affordability and lifestyle opportunities for residents.
- e) Encourage well-designed public gathering places that:
  - i) Are pedestrian and cyclist-friendly, safe, accessible, and attractive;
  - ii) Respect and enhance community identity and character;
  - iii) Address the needs of residents of all ages and abilities; and
  - iv) Enable passive and active recreation and cultural activities.
- f) The expansion of a Hamlet Growth Area boundary should only be considered when 50% of the gross area has been developed, and shall require an amendment to the local area structure plan.
- g) The County should develop main street commercial guidelines and future development should comply with these guidelines.
- h) Hamlet main streets or central business areas are encouraged to develop with a consistent urban design theme that is pedestrian friendly.

## 2.5.2 Small Hamlets

Hamlets across Rocky View County range from those with a wide variety of services and relatively steady growth, like Hamlet Growth Areas, to those with fewer services and lower levels of growth. These Small Hamlets include Bottrel, Cochrane Lake, Dalemead, Dalroy, Delacour, Indus, Kathryn, Keoma, Indus, and Madden. They form a traditional part of the County's rural landscape, each with their own distinct character. The County will continue to maintain existing levels of service for these rural communities, ensuring sustained quality of life for residents. Due to their more isolated location, and the availability of more sustainable development locations across the county, the County may not prioritize infrastructure and servicing upgrades in Small Hamlets. However, additional growth that is in keeping with the character of these hamlets is appropriate.

- a) New development should occur within the existing hamlet boundary as opposed to expanding boundaries.
- b) Commercial development, if appropriately scaled to the surrounding area, should be supported to provide services to meet the day-to-day needs of residents or local businesses.
- c) Development of Small Hamlets should be guided by, and conform to, the existing applicable area structure plan or conceptual scheme.
- d) Development of Small Hamlets without an existing applicable area structure plan or conceptual scheme should be guided by the policies and direction of the MDP, and other applicable County policies and bylaws.
- e) Encourage a variety of housing forms to be developed in Small Hamlets in order to provide a range of affordability and lifestyle opportunities for residents.

Regards,

Asad Niazi, P.Eng., MBA



#127, 18 Royal Vista Link NW, Calgary AB, T3R 0K4

O: 403.239.1952

C: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

[www.canopylands.com](http://www.canopylands.com)

*Your dreams are not big enough if they don't scare you*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] - MDP Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:20:01 AM

---

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <[MMitton@rockyview.ca](mailto:MMitton@rockyview.ca)>  
Date: Tue, Feb 16, 2021 at 9:01 AM  
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] - MDP Bylaw C-8090-2020  
To: [REDACTED], <[LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca](mailto:LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca)>

Good morning,

Please submit your comments to [publichearings@rockyview.ca](mailto:publichearings@rockyview.ca)

Thank you,

Michelle

**Michelle Mitton**, M.Sc  
Legislative Coordinator – Legislative Services

**Rocky View County**

262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2

Phone: 403-520- 1290 |

[MMitton@rockyview.ca](mailto:MMitton@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://www.rockyview.ca)

---

**From:** Karen Singer <[karenleesinger@gmail.com](mailto:karenleesinger@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:00 AM  
**To:** Legislative Services Shared <[LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca](mailto:LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - MDP Bylaw C-8090-2020

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

Hello my name is Karen Singer. I live at SW 1/4 29 28 03 w 5th, which is located in the NW area of RVC.

I do not fully support the final Draft of the MDP, therefore, I ask that the Draft MDP as presented would be rejected. I have made recommended changes for your careful consideration and would ask that you adopt these recommendations into the next draft of the MDP.

My main area of concern is focused on the preservation and protection of rural agricultural

areas. Agriculture is important, but more importantly, agriculture is vital. It's a vital food supply for people and the livestock we raise and care for.

## Section 1 - Introduction

### 1.3 Vision and Guiding Principles

#### Guiding Principles

#### 4. Agriculture

Rocky View County will continue to support traditional agriculture and agricultural diversification and innovation, recognizing agriculture as **an important** part of the County's identity and economy. Rocky View County will encourage opportunities for value added agricultural businesses to develop and grow

**Recommendation:** Replace the words "an important" with "a vital".

### 1.4 Rocky View County Context

Half way into the first paragraph on page 5: In the County's western reaches, coniferous forests of the Rocky Mountain Foothills **transition to rolling hills scattered with ranches. Moving eastward, the foothills give way to prairie grasslands and wetlands.** Eastern Rocky View County is dominated with agricultural operations, including the production of hay, cereal and oilseed crops.

**Recommendation:** Re-word the highlighted section because the way it's written is somewhat misleading. The vast majority of this area of Rocky View is predominantly Agricultural / Farming. This is not currently worded in a way that depicts the actual occupancy of the lands going west to east.

### 1.6 The Planning Framework

#### 1.6.4 Non-Statutory Plans Land Use Bylaw

The Land Use Bylaw is a regulatory bylaw of the County required by the Municipal Government Act. Every parcel of land in the County has a land use district, and the Land Use Bylaw details the permitted and discretionary land uses in each district and regulates the development of land and buildings within the county.

**Recommendation:** Add a policy enabling Council to approve the redistricting of lands by a non-owner. (See [Laux & Stuart-Palmer](#), Status to Apply, Duty to Process an Application, January 2019 Planning Law and Practice in Alberta). Redistricted Lands that have subsequently been verified and proved to be in violation of the MDP, should face a redesignation re-evaluation, enabling an appeal if demanded.

## Section 2 - Land Use Policies

### 2.2 Growth Areas

**Figure 2:** Growth Concept Map Identifying Priority Areas for Growth

**Recommendation:** Add Agricultural Areas to the legend on the map indicating those areas are recognized and accounted for.

**Sentence at bottom (left column) of page 15:** The Growth Concept Map identifies other areas that need to be considered when planning for additional growth:

**Recommendation:** Add Agricultural Lands to the list, along with Ecological Features, Waterbodies, Provincial Parks.

**Top of page 15: Ecological Features:** These potentially important ecological features include wetlands, riparian areas, **valuable agricultural soils**, and wildlife corridors. These areas may not be appropriate for additional development, and should be considered when area structure plans and conceptual schemes are created or amended.

**Recommendation:** Valuable agricultural soils should not be a courteous mention in between the commas of other Ecological Features. Valuable Agricultural (soils) Land should have a heading and paragraph of its own and listed separately. Throughout the County the invaluable Ecological Features are so often fit in together with the Agricultural Areas.

Additionally, a general ASP should be developed for the NW and NE sections of the County in order to guide and direct County decisions on the different types of applications being submitted for Land Redesignations or Developments.

**Page 15:** Sourcewater protection is of particular concern when identifying and protecting ecological features. Section 3.5 contains policies for development in and near ecological features.

**Recommendation:** Define Sourcewater. Is it the same as groundwater, surface water, or a water body like a lake, slough, creek or river?

**Page 15: Waterbodies:** These rivers, streams, and large wetlands provide aesthetic and ecological benefits. Future development should avoid or mitigate impacts to these areas

**Recommendations:** Groundwater sources (aquifers) should also be included in the list of waterbodies. More emphasis needs to be given to the size of development and its intended water demand. Extra scrutiny is needed in agricultural areas where farmers and families use well water for agricultural operations, for their livestock, and for their household use. Everyone in rural areas rely on water from the aquifer through a well system, and a large development could be devastating.

## 2.3 Residential Development

### 2.3.1 Primary Residential Areas, 2.3.2 Country Residential Development, 2.3.3 Fragmented Country Residential Development

**Recommendation:** This entire section and their sub-sections should be re-written to provide better clarity. It is very confusing and hard to follow. Definitions need to be provided to precisely differentiate the differences between these areas and types of development.

#### Additional Recommendations for this section:

#### 2.3.1 Primary Residential Areas

b) New development may occur outside of identified priority growth areas with Council review and approval.

**Recommendation:** Reword to include - New development may occur outside of identified priority growth areas with Council review and approval, if appropriate and shall be compatible with the surrounding area.

### 2.3.2 Country Residential Development

b) Where *residential development* with two or more dwelling units and greater than 4 hectares (9.9 acres) is proposed... Council should give consideration to:

**Recommendation:** Add bullet point about Water. Consider the impact on the water usage the development will have and how it would affect the groundwater (aquifer) and ability for groundwater recharge. Wells in the surrounding area need to be protected.

### 2.3.3 Fragmented Country Residential Development

a) Within a *fragmented quarter section*, the redesignation of residential lots or **agricultural parcels** less than or equal to 4 hectares (9.9 acres) in size to a new residential land use may be supported if planning, consultation, and technical assessment information is provided to the satisfaction of the County and:

**Recommendation:** define agricultural parcel. Consider rewording this sentence for better clarity. Remove the words "agricultural parcels" and replace with "rural lands". Is the word 'agricultural parcel' a generic term used to describe all lands outside of a Hamlet, Town or City regardless of the zoning, or is it referring to 'agricultural parcels' that have a land designation for Agricultural use?

c) Within a *fragmented quarter section*, the redesignation or subdivision of **agriculture parcels** greater than 4 hectares (9.9 acres) in size to a residential use should not be supported.

**Recommendation:** Define "agricultural parcel". Remove the words "agriculture parcels" and replace with "rural lands"

## Section 3 - County-Wide Policies

### 3.1.1 Financial Sustainability Policies

4. h) **Prior to approving** a development proposal, the County should ensure that **infrastructure servicing has been identified and planned for, and that** full cost recovery methods are in place to capture the capital and interest cost of development.

**Recommendation:** A policy should be implemented to ensure that prior to approving a development proposal, the Application for a development or land redesignation has met all the requirements of the MDP through an internal vetting process or other type of screening process in the Planning Department. This thorough vetting policy will save countless hours of work and associated financial costs associated with a long SDAB Appeal hearing for a development that should have had its Land Redesignation Application or its Conditional Development Permit rejected, due to its violations in the MDP. If the Planning Department doesn't screen out Applications that do not meet the MDP objectives and policies, then the affected neighbors and other persons affected will be relied upon to catch the error and appeal it. This should not happen.

j) Facilitate economic development **by linking** investors and developers to investment opportunities,

**providing assistance** where feasible, and reducing barriers to companies wishing to invest in the County.

**Recommendation:** I recommend reconsidering this idea and removing it. I think it's an unwise policy and ripe, in my opinion, for potential lawsuits. In the event that RVC "facilitates" and "links" a developer to an investor and the business relationship were to reach an impassable disagreement, then what potential liability would RVC open themselves up to as a result?

### 3.2.1 Transportation Planning and Development

i) Residential redesignation and subdivision applications should provide for development that:

**Recommendation:** Subdivisions and other business developments should not be approved unless the access road to the Subdivision or Business Development is a paved access road. The road should be upgraded in relation to the increased volume of traffic accessing the Subdivision or Business Development.

9.

## 3.4 Agriculture

### Objectives

The policies within the Agriculture Policy Area are to ensure the following objectives:

- The agriculture sector remains **an important** component of the county's economy.

**Recommendation:** Replace the words "an important" with the words "a vital". Food is vital, not important - for people and livestock alike.

- Adverse impacts on agriculture from non- agricultural land uses are **minimized**

**Recommendation:** Replace the word "minimized" to "discouraged". The definition of the word "minimized" is open to interpretation and meaning.

## 3.5 Environment

### 1. Objectives

The policies within the Environment Policy Area are to ensure the following objectives:

- Drinking water sources are protected.

**Recommendation:** Add groundwater (aquifers) and groundwater recharge areas to the bullet point list. Groundwater should be protected in rural area communities because they rely solely on their well water supply (drawn from groundwater) for their domestic water use in their home, as well as their Agricultural and Livestock Operations. Ground water recharge areas need to be protected in order to maintain the groundwater levels.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020 question  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 10:25:31 AM

---

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

Clarification request on how CMRB has been followed in not breaking up Commercial area , CMRB recommended to use current areas; rural urban sprawl should be added to current hamlets or develop a hamlet with their own water and waste water management, transportation corridors for both freight and commuter, ect. What is the water and waste water plan for growth areas, where is the water coming from and waste going to for growth areas?

Deb Vickery

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Re: Bylaw C-8090-2020 question  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:44:22 AM

---

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

We Garth VICKERY and Debbie VICKERY agree and support Ena Spalding non-support of the MDP.

Springbank Resident 's

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

On Feb 16, 2021, at 10:25 AM, Debbie Vickery [REDACTED] wrote:

Clarification request on how CMRB has been followed in not breaking up Commercial area , CMRB recommended to use current areas; rural urban sprawl should be added to current hamlets or develop a hamlet with their own water and waste water management, transportation corridors for both freight and commuter, ect. What is the water and waste water plan for growth areas, where is the water coming from and waste going to for growth areas?

Deb Vickery

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - BYLAW C-8090-2020 Mr. Martin Griggs presentation supported!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:55:22 AM

---

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

Mr. Martin Griggs presentation supported!  
Debbie and Garth VICKERY  
Springbank residents

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:02:06 PM

---

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

Janet Ballantyne presentation supported!  
Debbie and Garth VICKERY  
Springbank residents

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8090-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:41:47 PM

---

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

We support all 10 presenters that are not in favour of the MDP !

Do not accept this MDP and take all presenters presentations to incorporate all points for for a revised MDP.

Remember that the presentations by Ena Spalding and Janet Ballantyne have spoken on behalf of just under 1000 Springbank Residences!

Please do not accept the MDP .

Debbie and Garth VICKERY

Springbank residence

Debbie Vickery

Sent from my iPad

*If there are spelling/punctuation errors in my message, please forgive the smartness of my iPad..*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Cc:** [Legislative Services Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - New Municipal Development Plan Bylaw C - 8090.2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:09:53 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

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

To [publichearings@rockyview.ca](mailto:publichearings@rockyview.ca)  
CC [legislativeservices@rockyview.ca](mailto:legislativeservices@rockyview.ca)

**Stewardship of Groundwater:**

Currently, Rocky View County Land use does not consider water in decisions yet resulting mitigation costs are covered by Tax Dollars. These budgets are being stressed. Mandatory Guidelines should be included in the New Development Plan. The Calgary Metropolitan Region Board Growth and Servicing Plan gives considerable attention to water. Limited groundwater resources are being additionally stressed due to Development and the Provincial Boss Order that mandates no NEW Surface Water be licensed.

There should be protection for the following:

1. Confined and unconfined aquifers in slow recharge water deficient areas.
2. Paskapoo Formation Areas of Recharge.
3. Areas that don't have access to surface water.

The Province legislated Water Councils to facilitate the 'Water for Life Strategy' but no Council was set up to support Groundwater users.

The Province is responsible for licensing water diversions but does not accept "INDIRECTLY AFFECTED" Statements of Concern. The Paskapoo Formation groundwater system is complex and Indirectly Connected. The province deems Indirectly Affected users concerns to not be valid.

**Recreational Zoned Areas:**

The Plan should include mandatory feasibility guidelines: eg; facilities drawing a large influx of people should be close to service centres.

Rob Watson

NE / 31 / 28 / 03 / 05

This email is sent by one of the companies of the Canaccord Genuity group of companies which includes Canaccord Genuity Group Inc., Canaccord Genuity Corp., Canaccord Genuity Wealth & Estate Planning Services Ltd., Canaccord Genuity Wealth Management (USA) Inc., Canaccord Genuity LLC (with offices in the United States) and Canaccord Genuity Limited (with offices in the United Kingdom). See [www.canaccordgenuitygroup.com/en/companies](http://www.canaccordgenuitygroup.com/en/companies) for more information on the companies of the group. Any of these companies can be contacted through the group head office at 2200 – 609 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C. V7Y 1H2. You may unsubscribe at any time by [clicking here](#). For more information, email [antispam@canaccordgenuity.com](mailto:antispam@canaccordgenuity.com).

---

Canaccord Genuity Wealth Management is a division of Canaccord Genuity Corp. This

message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged, confidential or subject to copyright. Internet communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, arrive late or contain viruses. The information contained in this e-mail is drawn from sources believed to be reliable, but the accuracy and completeness of the information is not guaranteed, nor in providing it does Canaccord Genuity Corp. or its subsidiaries, or affiliated companies, "The Firm" assume any liability.

Canaccord Genuity Corp., its subsidiaries or affiliated companies, disclaims all responsibility and accepts no liability (including negligence) for the consequences for any person acting, or refraining from acting, on such information. Unless otherwise stated, this transmission is neither an offer nor the solicitation of an offer to sell or purchase any investment. As a solicitation, this e-mail was intended for distribution in those jurisdictions where The Firm is registered as advisors or dealers in securities. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited.

When addressed to our clients, any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing Canaccord Genuity Corp., its subsidiaries or affiliated companies' client agreements. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return email and destroy and delete the message from your computer. (Disclaimer)