

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020 - South Springbank ASP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:06:23 PM

---

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

Administration has said that they have concluded that market-driven development across the entire ASP is optimal.

How can that possibly be preferable to directing growth to occur in an orderly manner?

Administration also noted that ASP area has not built out as quickly as anticipated as their justification for shifting to cluster residential from traditional country residential. What evidence is there that rate of growth had anything to do with the mix of development available under the existing ASP rather than just overall growth being slower than ASP may have hoped.

I would appreciate answers to these questions.

thank you,  
Janet Ballantyne

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:16:49 PM

---

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

The discussion in this ASP public hearing is getting South and North ASPs completely confused. This is making a farce of the public hearing.

Since Council insisted that the ASP be split into two ASPs, the public hearing discussion should keep them separated. The fact that Council is failing to do this indicates that the decision to split the ASPs was nonsensical.

It is also extremely troubling to hear Council say that it has been directing Admin on what land uses should be where in the ASP. I had thought this was what public engagement was for and that the recommendations should reflect that input, not simply Council's direction.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:26:41 PM

---

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

Pushing development to cluster residential does not do anything to improve connectivity between communities. All that is needed to achieve that connectivity is to make better allocation of municipal reserves and/or easements.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:36:40 PM

---

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

Wastewater options for South Springbank is of critical concern for proposed development - the substantial increase in densities need to be supported by proper wastewater. If wastewater options do not do this, the residential density proposals will not be environmentally sustainable. Communal wastewater treatment systems clearly do a better job than stand-alone systems in terms of quality of treated water that comes out the end. However, communal systems still put all their treated wastewater, however higher its quality, back into the land. Continually piping in potable water through water coops and disposing of wastewater on site is not sustainable in the long run.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:38:54 PM

---

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

Growth rate in South Springbank ASP - Admin stated that the ASP is not anticipated to build out in the next twenty years. That appears to be contradicted in what the supporting Traffic study said - it states that it was directed to assume full build out within 20 years.

An explanation for this discrepancy would be appreciated.

Thanks,  
Janet Ballantyne

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 7:01:05 PM

---

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

The suggestion of using cluster residential as the transition between Calgary and RVC makes a great deal of sense. Fully piped servicing is being proposed for that area so the concerns about the lack of full servicing for cluster residential elsewhere in Springbank are less relevant.

As speakers have noted, there needs to be a proper transition between Calgary and existing country residential that preserves Springbank's unique character.

These changes are well worth investigating, but to do so needs further time and consultation.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Videos for South Springbank ASP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:44:47 PM

---

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

They are all north Springbank ASP not south.

**John F. Bargman**

C: [REDACTED]

T: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 5:14:33 PM

---

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

Good afternoon,

With respect to the discussions held this afternoon, I feel that it is important to highlight that for myself (as well as all but two of now 22 residents that I have now spoken with about the draft ASP), the only communication that we received from the County regarding this initiative was the hearing notice mailed to our residence at the end of January.

Prior to this, we received no letters, no phone calls, no invitations, had no road-signs in our area, no social media ads, etc. Without such, there was no way for us to know of what was proposed. In that vein, we submit that it would be pertinent to not approve the ASP as is, with respect to the Special Planning Areas (my interest is Special Planning Area 3).

What's proposed puts a heavy burden on the landowner in terms of requiring an ASP amendment to achieve a designation, which would also then be subject to the Metro Board's plan in effect at that time (vs. being grandfathered under the Interim Growth Plan). As such, we are requesting greater certainty with the application of a more defined designation. At the same time, with the lack of consultation in these areas, how can Council and the County in good faith move forward in negotiating the future of these lands with the City of Calgary - in the absence of the views of existing landowners?

Further, I would note that the owner of the Eastern portion of lands in proposed Special Area 3 (the Zinks), in their written submission assert that they were directed by the County to consult with area residents. I wish to note that I do not believe such consultation occurred. (Most of the 22 area residents I spoke with had no knowledge of who even owned those lands, let alone the views of that owner). Certainly as the 2nd largest landowner within proposed Special Planning Area 3, owning the lands immediately adjacent to theirs, we have not been consulted. In fact, it was I who reached out to them in the last two weeks to consult with them about the written submission that I provided. Further, I would attest to the fact that I have spoken with all five other owners from within proposed Special Area 3, all those parties indicated that they had not had discussions with the Zinks).

It seems to me that if a decision is to be made about an area of land, such should not be driven by one owner alone (who has clearly had opportunity to engage in the process, not afforded to the others in the area) particularly when other owners with a differing view represent half of the land in the respective area.

In accordance with our written submission (page 416) and video - we request that Council please consider either our proposed alternative for Special Area 3 (we are requesting the designation of Cluster Residential), or delay approval of the ASP until proper (actual) consultation can be undertaken with the many owners and residents in this area who have not had sufficient opportunity to provide input otherwise.



I apologize for re-iterating a position which has otherwise already been covered in writing and by video. Rather, the intent of this e-mail is to note that **what has been shared with Council via this hearing with regards to consultation efforts is not consistent with the “lived” experience of residents from within and immediately adjacent to proposed Special Planning Area 3.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Rob Gray

24166 Township Road 242 / Kathy Sieber 24170 Township Road 242



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw # C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:08:52 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.jpg](#)

---

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

Hello Rocky View Council,

My partners and I own 4.14 acres located at 24137 Old Banff Coach Road. I believe we are designated as special area 1 alongside Burnco. My concern is that our site will be heavily influenced by what the Burnco group desires and our voice will be diminished. My assumption is that Burnco will want to exhaust their resources before seeing any future development options. Thank you for your time and attention.

This is a [LINK](#) to what we do.

BART HRIBAR

President



*"CREATING DESIRABLE SPACES"*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Email submission re: C-8031-2020 and C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 7:31:11 PM

---

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

Hello,

I have been listening intently to the above-referenced public hearings. I have heard a number of comments suggesting that water rights are not available in quantities to support planned growth in Springbank.

I would like to dispel that myth!

Between existing water licences in the area, including over 1000 acre-feet held by Bow Water & Land LP, and available water licences in the South Saskatchewan Basin, BE ASSURED that Rocky View can access the water rights required to support future growth.

Please contact me if you would like further information or would like to access additional water rights.

Best,

**Davin MacIntosh** (JD, LL.M, MBA)  
*President, Water Transfer Alberta*

T [REDACTED]  
E [\[REDACTED\]](#)

This email and any attachment(s) are confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by return email, delete this email, and do not copy, use or disclose it.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Submission for Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:10:27 AM  
**Attachments:** [South Springbank ASP Verbal.odt](#)

---

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

Please find attached a submission from the residents of Longeway Place re: the South Springbank ASP.

--

Kim

Rocky View Council, please accept this as our collective OPPOSITION to the following Bylaw:

**Bylaw C-8064-2020**  
**File # 1015-550**  
**South Springbank ASP**

**Submitted by:**

John Beveridge	3 Longeway Place
Jerry & Diane Arshinoff	9 Longeway Place
Sharon & Darren Anderson	15 Longeway Place
Ellie Janz	18 Longeway Place
Chris & Trish Hunt	23 Longeway Place
Mike & Jennifer Dunn	30 Longeway Place
Cyndy Craig & Jan Trott	36 Longeway Place

We are all OPPOSED to changes made to the current Central Springbank ASP and to dividing that ASP into North and South ASPs and we are asking that Council TABLE.

Regarding the proposed South Springbank ASP, we are all opposed to:

1. Almost **tripling** the population of South Springbank from 5847 to over 30,000, mainly through increasing the density on smaller lots over larger areas of land and infill
2. Expanding water servicing infrastructure without the necessary wastewater servicing.
3. Reducing the UPA to .89, less than 1 acre without wastewater servicing.
4. Not considering the results of the public engagements, coffee chats, online surveys, etc, in which the majority of residents did not envision - or agree with - such expansive development proposed here.
5. Industrial and business land uses in residential areas bordering Calgary, with interim uses and interim servicing solutions
6. Extensive Cluster housing and Villa housing with no connection to wastewater servicing, which **should be a requirement to completely remove** all treated wastewater from the lands.
7. Finding a new red-lined version of both ASPs a full week after comments were due with changes to ASPs.
8. Lack of “Shall” clauses and too many “Should” clauses
9. The fact that the CMRB projected growth in Springbank is only 17,000 over the next 20 years, yet the South Springbank ASP anticipates over 30,000. Along with the North Springbank ASP projections, this anticipates about 50,000 residents on 23,000 acres of Country Residential lands.
10. Strong potential for duplication of services that are in Calgary and Cochrane.
11. Lack of long-term support for agriculture, as it exists today, by throwing support behind

agricultural diversity or “Transitions” to new land uses.

12. Not following the CMRB and IGP policies of directing new growth to existing approved developments, such as the business areas of Balzac and Omni or the residential areas already approved in Springbank, namely Harmony, Bingham Crossing, Springbank Creek, Timberstone, River Edge, Escarpment Drive and Aventerra. These ALL provide a diversity of housing.

13. The creation of Special Planning Areas with interim commercial uses with servicing constraints, dependent upon cooperation from Calgary. In the case of this ASP, interim means up to 25 years! Soft services are identified here but Rocky View has **no** guiding bylaw.

14. Urban Interface Areas have limited servicing and this is unacceptable.

15. Business Residential Transition – 50 m setback is far too small and has the potential for conflict, and the creation of light and more noise where there was none before.

16. Residential Form Transition – 25 m setback from agriculture is FAR too short.

17. Agricultural Transition – approving urbanized areas next to agricultural areas does not work, even with berms, fences, storm water ponds, etc. Take a look at how poorly this worked for Cochrane when it built the dense community of Fireside next to the Wineglass Ranch lands.

18. Agriculture - Why is the Agriculture Master Plan missing from this draft? Right to Farm, Agricultural Operations Practices Act and Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines are not strong enough to stop the inching in of development that is completely inappropriate. Weak language like “should” does nothing to protect agriculture operations or the rich agricultural history of Springbank.

20. Natural and Historic Environment

It is remarkable that livestock uses cannot exist in wildlife corridors but dense populations of people can?

Vegetation “should” be incorporated into developments to prevent human/wildlife conflict?

Fencing “should” reduce obstructions to wildlife movement?

Local plans “should” minimize removal of vegetation within wildlife corridors?

Vehicular access “should” be minimized within wildlife corridors?

Wildlife corridors “should” be supported by a Biophysical Assessment?

Wetlands “should” be dedicated as ER or ER easement?

Riparian areas “should” maintain the the natural riparian function?

Provincial guidelines “should” be followed re: requirement of Historical Resources Application is required?

The list is extensive and wording is completely lacking in substance.

21. Scenic and Community Corridors

On the one hand, this draft identifies the visually attractive entrances to Springbank, but weak language destroys the intent of keeping these entrances appealing.

Outside storage “shall” not be considered but “may” be considered as ancillary uses. As well, “interim uses” of storage are allowed within Special Planning Area 1, with up to 30% of the site.

We all know that screening does absolutely nothing to hide storage. Take a look at Commercial Court.

22. Stormwater

The map on P 78 shows numerous stormwater drainage catchments that happen to coincide with wildlife corridors. What is the large plan to protect homes from flooding in these areas and to

ensure that wildlife corridors are protected? These concepts exist in silos when they should be incorporated together.

### 23. Aggregate Extraction

What is the overall plan for aggregate extraction? The current ASP defines it, but this one does not. Do the lands with gravel just remain unprotected from residential use until a gravel pit is depleted?

#### Summary:

- As a Plan that will be reviewed every 10 years, this ASP is far too complex.
- This draft was created without any public consultation at all, whereas the previous drafts were.
- Wastewater servicing must be available to all new residential cluster uses to save the integrity of the land's ability to deal with grey water.
- If market demand will drive development, why must land use be identified so far in advance of actual use?
- The projected population is more than the entirety of Rocky View County itself.
- This ASP is too ambitious, making it both unrealistic and unreasonable - but it is a developer's dream.
- What is the point of applying “interim” use to all the lands adjacent to Calgary?
- Policies are slack and riddled with weak statements.
- What this looks like is a feeble attempt to slide a new ASP into the IGP and CMRB, with emphasis on development and no regard for the country residential character of Springbank.
- The lack of feasible servicing is environmentally and socially problematic.

Overall, this ASP exercise has been a complete waste of money and time.

Residents invested so much effort and time for over almost 4 years into a Plan that really didn't need an over-haul at all.

But the final insult is being shown draft ASPs to separate Springbank into two ASP's that thoroughly disregards their comments and input.

**Please TABLE this until the community has had a fulsome opportunity to examine all these major changes to our Central Springbank ASP.**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - South ASP Questions  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 5:43:09 PM

---

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

Does anyone have a rational explanation as to why the current ASP really needs to be split at all?

How does splitting the ASP benefit anyone?

--

Kim



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Springbank ASP Questions  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 5:48:36 PM

---

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

It is concerning that one ASP was considered in April 2020, then staff was directed to look into splitting it, which happened in July 2020.  
Residents do not want 2 ASPs.

Since that time, there has been abysmal resident notification or engagement about this split - until the Public Hearing notifications were sent out in January.

It would be much appreciated if these two ASPs could be Tabled until meaningful public participation is complete.

--

Kim

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Springbank ASP Wastewater Solution?  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 5:57:25 PM

---

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

How many stand-alone wastewater systems do you anticipate?

I'm rather disturbed that these ASP's will consider higher density with wastewater treatment plants - with the expectation that treated wastewater will have no effect on the water table.

I propose that groundwater assessments not be left to individual developers at the land use stage, but rather an overall study should be done by Rocky View County to determine what areas can and cannot be developed due to high water table.

--

Kim

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Legislative Services Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Springbank ASP Servicing Strategy  
**Date:** Friday, February 12, 2021 10:54:50 AM

---

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

Good Morning,

I have been looking at the Springbank ASP Servicing Strategy and have a few questions.

I live in Springbank on Deer Springs Close. Deer Springs along with Windmill Way, Calling Horse Estates, and The Ranch all currently are supplied water from Saltbox Coulee Water Supply Company Ltd. Windmill and Calling Horse have co-ops and buy bulk from Saltbox, whereas The Ranch and Deer Springs have individual homes connected directly to Saltbox distribution. In total, Saltbox services 74 houses and has no other customer base. All four communities are very dissatisfied with the service and cost of our water supply from Saltbox to the extent that one of the Co-ops is considering sourcing their water from another source. This move if it occurs, will cause Saltbox to fail, or result in an increase in rates for the remaining three communities in excess of 100%. We are already paying some of the highest rates for water in Alberta so either of these options would cause significant stress on the homes and families involved.

We are hoping to develop alternative plans to ensure our communities do not endure an extended period without water, should Saltbox fail. The ASP Servicing Strategy shows a potential future pipeline along Range Road 250 that passes directly by our four communities in both of the scenarios (Calgary and Harmony). Is there someone at the County that we could speak to regarding our situation to find out if adding our communities to the build-out plan in the ASP is possible and if an accelerated pipeline build might be possible to avoid a water supply outage.

I can be reached at [REDACTED] or email [REDACTED]

I look forward to your response.

David McColl

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - FW: South Springbank ASP Comment Submission  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:02:38 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[South Springbank ASP Comments from Peters Dewald 03 February 2021.pdf](#)

---

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

On Behalf of our client Peters Dewald Company, please find attached our comment submission for the South Springbank ASP.

Thanks,



**Geoff Dyer**

Partner | Master Planning and Urban Design Strategic Lead | MEDes (Urban Design), CNUa

d | [REDACTED]

c | [REDACTED]

follow | [@gdurbanist](#)

**B&A Planning Group** | Proudly Celebrating 30 Years in Business | 600, 215 – 9th Avenue SW | Calgary, AB T2P

1K3 | [bapg.ca](#)



This communication and attached files are intended for the use of the addressee(s) ONLY and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. Any use, distribution or copying in whatever manner of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please inform us promptly by reply email, then delete this communication and destroy any printed copy. B&A Planning Group thanks you for your attention and cooperation.

**03 February 2021**

Municipal Clerk's Office  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

Attn: County Council through the Municipal Clerk's Office

**Re: Comments on the South Springbank ASP Public Hearing**

On behalf of our clients Jim Dewald, Ruth Peters, and John Taylor of the Peters Dewald company, we respectfully submit these comments for the upcoming public hearing of the South Springbank ASP.

We are excited about the vision to enhance Range Road 33 as an important focal point for the community and have appreciated working with County Staff and other stakeholders as the plans have evolved. Nearly fifteen years ago, The Peters Dewald company purchased just over 82 acres of the Buckley family lands on the west side of Range Road 33, just south of Elbow Valley Elementary School and Springbank Middle School. Their vision for these lands has been to create a community focal point in the form of a walkable, traditional rural village as a setting for community services, small local businesses, a range of public spaces, and a vibrant destination for nearby residents. Importantly, it would also bring a modest number of family-oriented single-family residences into walkable proximity to adjacent schools and bring a vibrancy to nearby existing and planned institutional and commercial uses.

The Buckley Village vision is viewed by the Peters Dewald company as an important legacy project that fills a critical missing gap in the larger vision of Springbank's core. They are fortunate to have the patience to see their vision through in step with community aspirations. Fortunately, the proposed Village concept fulfills a majority of policies and requirements of the proposed ASP. However, there are three areas that pose significant barriers to the project, and that will likely hold the community back from realizing their aspirations for a vibrant community centre. To this end we respectfully ask Staff and Council to consider these comments and proposed amendments:

**1. A Community Center is more than a Retirement Community:** In proximity to existing schools, employers, and both existing and planned institutional uses, a diversity of residents is critical. Current policies are aimed at those who can either afford a large-lot country residential lifestyle or the proposed "Villa Condo" which is aimed at single story, stairless homes for retirees and those with disabilities. Although the Villa Condo allows for up to 4 units per acres, its exclusionary definition prevents diversity at the community's centre, particularly young families who may wish to move near schools, jobs, and services. To this end we request considering a wider, more inclusive definition for residential at this intensity, while maintaining the rural feel of house-scaled residential forms.

**Requested Policy Revision 1.**

7.47 Villa Condo developments within the Plan area should:

...

b) ~~predominantly be~~ accommodate single-family scaled buildings including stairless, single-storey bungalows or attached units (two units); two storey single-family homes or duplex/semi-detached; and accessory laneway housing.

**2. Local Plan Land Use Composition:** Local Plans will be a great way to focus in on policies specific to a smaller geographic area. It is anticipated that these Local Plan areas will encompass multiple landowners and include both existing and future land uses. While it is understandable that there will need to be limitations and balancing of land uses within a Local Plan, policies aimed at limiting the percentage of a certain land use within a plan area (i.e., residential shall be no more than 25% of plan area) will be difficult firstly because of the inclusion of multiple property owners in a plan area (who gets the 25%?), but more importantly in response to currently undefined geographic area (what is included in the plan area to determine how big 25% of the plan area is?). Because this process is County led, specific land use areas should be determined through the Local Plan process in response to community and landowner consultation in response to the needs and constraints of the local area.

**Requested Policy Revision 2.**

7.49 Villa Condo developments can be limited by land area through a Local Plan. It should account for a maximum of 10% of the gross developable area of the a ~~proposed~~ local plan, except when it forms part of a Commercial or Institutional and Community Service development. ~~land use area~~ where it should account for a ~~maximum of 25% of the gross developable~~ be limited in response to the needs and constraints of the Local Plan area in response to landowner and community consultation. ~~of the proposed local plan.~~ Local Plan areas within Institutional and Community Service may include existing Institutional and Community Services as part of the plan area.

**3. Build-Out Restrictions:** The ASP anticipates a number of build-out restrictions for residential uses throughout the ASP including the Institutional and Community Services in Section 8.0. The idea would be to ensure certain community service and institutional uses are built before residential subdivision is approved. While understandable, the prescribed percentages blanketed through the plan may not be feasible and may in turn hold back the very land uses these policies are meant to ensure. The "Local Plans" process allows for policy to respond more directly to the needs of a specific area. To this end, it is requested that for Section 8.0, these ASP policies are more general in nature, directing specific build-out requirements to the Local Plan process. It is notable that holding back private development in lieu of funding and constructing public institutional uses, the complete build-out of community services and commercial uses before the supporting "rooftops" are built, and the possibility of one private development being subject to the performance of another private development parcel, are all complications likely to sterilize development of these areas altogether.

***Requested Policy Revision 3.***

8.5 Residential development may be supported within the Institutional and Community Services areas identified along Range Road 33 on Map 05: Land Use Strategy, subject to the development meeting the policies set out within Section 7 of this Plan and the following criteria:

...

d) **Through the local plan process, it may be** established that a certain percentage of ~~60% of the~~ proposed Villa Condo development proposed within a local plan shall not receive **a percentage of** subdivision approval until ~~certain~~ the proposed institutional and community services **and/or commercial uses** have been constructed **within parcels of contiguous, single ownership. This shall be established in consultation with the landowner as part of the Local Plan process. Controlled** ~~through appropriate phasing of subdivision approvals.~~

On behalf of our clients at Peters Dewald Company, we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this Area Structure Plan.

Respectfully Submitted,



**Geoff Dyer**

Partner | Master Planning and Urban Design Strategic Lead | MEDes (Urban Design), CNUA

c | [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Supporting videos are for North NOT South ASP  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:43:27 PM

---

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

These supporting videos are NOT for South Springbank but  
NORTH!  
YYou have some explaining to do!



**From:** [Joan E Allen](#)  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Cc:** [Grant Berg](#); [Scott Taylor](#); [Dominic Kazmierczak](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Special Council Meeting Agenda E.2 & E.3 Bylaw C-8064-2020 and Bylaw C-8031-2020 (South and North Springbank Area Structure Plan)  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:33:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [TransAlta response to Feb 16 2021 council E.2 and E.3.pdf](#)

---

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

**Please include TransAlta's submission in Agenda items E.2 and E.3 at today's special council meeting.**

**In case you cannot access the attachment I have included the text below.**

*Dear Council:*

***RE: Special Council Meeting Agenda E.2 & E.3 Bylaw C-8064-2020 and Bylaw C-8031-2020 (South and North Springbank Area Structure Plan)***

*This letter is intended to provide TransAlta's concerns on Rocky View County's proposed North Springbank Area Structure Plan and South Springbank Area Structure Plan. At this time TransAlta does not support either of the Area Structure Plans as they do not recognize the individual purpose of TransAlta's lands, nor do they address the concerns and agreements covered by the Beaspaw Tri-Lateral Task Force.*

*Rocky View County, the City of Calgary and TransAlta recently participated in a Beaspaw Tri-Lateral Task Force to jointly discuss the goals and concerns regarding the Beaspaw reservoir. As discussed, TransAlta owns lands bordering the reservoir on both the north and south side and is very concerned about uncontrolled access to the reservoir.*

*TransAlta believes the plan as submitted does not appropriately reflect the purpose of TransAlta's lands in the land use designation, but rather a broad brush has been used and TransAlta's lands are incorrectly designated the same as bordering land uses. **TransAlta is requesting all lands bordering the reservoir be designated to reflect TransAlta's land use purpose and consultation and enhanced policies to ensure uncontrolled access is managed prior to land development.***

Thank you

JoanE

**Joan E. Allen | Land Asset Advisor**

**TRANSALTA CORPORATION**

T: 587-763-6745 | C: 780-222-9541

[Email](#) | [Web](#) | [Facebook](#) | [twitter](#)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This email is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person.



TransAlta Corporation

Box 1900, Station "M"  
110 - 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, Alberta  
T2P 2M1

T (403) 267-7110  
[www.transalta.com](http://www.transalta.com)

**Joan E. Allen**  
**Land Asset Advisor**

Direct Line: (587) 763-6745  
Email: [joane\\_allen@transalta.com](mailto:joane_allen@transalta.com)

February 16, 2021

Rocky View County Offices  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB  
T4A 0X2

**Sent via Email to [publichearings@rockyview.ca](mailto:publichearings@rockyview.ca)**  
**Attention: Legislative Services**

Dear Council:

**RE: Special Council Meeting Agenda E.2 & E.3 Bylaw C-8064-2020 and Bylaw C-8031-2020  
(South and North Springbank Area Structure Plan)**

This letter is intended to provide TransAlta's concerns on Rocky View County's proposed North Springbank Area Structure Plan and South Springbank Area Structure Plan. At this time TransAlta does not support either of the Area Structure Plans as they do not recognize the individual purpose of TransAlta's lands, nor do they address the concerns and agreements covered by the Beaspaw Tri-Lateral Task Force.

Rocky View County, the City of Calgary and TransAlta recently participated in a Beaspaw Tri-Lateral Task Force to jointly discuss the goals and concerns regarding the Beaspaw reservoir. As discussed, TransAlta owns lands bordering the reservoir on both the north and south side and is very concerned about uncontrolled access to the reservoir.

TransAlta believes the plan as submitted does not appropriately reflect the purpose of TransAlta's lands in the land use designation, but rather a broad brush has been used and TransAlta's lands are incorrectly designated the same as bordering land uses. **TransAlta is requesting all lands bordering the reservoir be designated to reflect TransAlta's land use purpose and consultation and enhanced policies to ensure uncontrolled access is managed prior to land development.**

Yours truly,

**TRANSALTA CORPORATION**

DocuSigned by:

*Joan E. Allen*

29E22CDAE9844AD...

JOAN E. ALLEN



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

Land Asset Advisor

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8064-2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 6:37:43 PM

---

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

FYI,  
All video presentations are not necessarily the same as the emailed reports. I know my presentation speaks of a different entity on the ASP than my written.

Thanks,  
Deb Vickery  
Springbank resident

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] - South Springbank ASP public hearing comments (C-8064-2020)  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 7:24:11 PM  
**Attachments:** [Screen Shot 2015-04-21 at 10.59.58 AM.png](#)

---

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

To members of Rocky View Council:

I am writing to support approval of the South Springbank ASP.

I represent the estate of Murray Atkins owner of land designated as Urban Interface Area which is south of Old Banff Coach Road and west of 101 Street SW adjacent to the West Ring Road and the interchange at Old Banff Coach Road and 101 Street SW. The land holding also includes land south of the MR Ravine and is designated as a Special Planning Area 2. These two areas will be separated formally by subdivision. It effectively is already separated by the MR Ravine.

The Urban Interface Area will provide for approved limited services for the commercial development. Development construction will install pipes for future connection to municipal or private utility companies. The land on which the Urban Interface Area is set apart from existing country residential with the MR Ravine buffer and treed land to the south of the ravine. Storm water ponds will be sized to provide fire flow storage sufficient for the development.

Traffic impacts on 101 Street SW will require twinning of that road system paid for by the developers of the adjacent lands.

It is important to note that approval of the ASP for the Urban Interface Area will require further planning applications and approvals. Included will be consultation with the City of Calgary, neighbouring residents, and Rocky View County. Nothing can be done without this additional layer of planning and approval. These application approvals are effectively the same as Special Planning Areas with the difference that subdivision will be allowed for permanent land use without amendment to the ASP to remove a Special Planning Designation.

The Special Planning Policies allow for commercial development for an interim period of time and subdivision is not allowed. Proposed Special Area Uses allow for limited services development.

Traffic impacts to the area will happen without any development approvals due to the proximity and construction of the West Ring Road. In addition, the lands contiguous to the east side of 101 Street will develop in the City of Calgary. GSL is considering development of an auto site on land they own in the City.

It is important that the ASP be approved so the additional required planning can occur as required by ASP policies to satisfy the County, the City and the residents. I know appropriate high quality development can occur on this land that is appropriately buffered, and will provide benefits to the neighbours and to Rocky View.

We request approval of this important document and congratulate the County in putting together a high quality vision for South Springbank in this plan. We appreciate the significant efforts and consultation provided by those involved in this document.

Thank you.

Robert Weston  
Barch, Life Member, AAA  
ERW Consulting Inc

P. [REDACTED]  
C. [REDACTED]  
E. [REDACTED]

198 Slopeview Dr SW Calgary AB  
T3H 4G5



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Public Hearings Shared; Rocky View County Office of the CAO](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] [Division 3, Kevin Hanson](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Public Hearing for South Springbank ASP CANNOT proceed  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:37:57 AM  
**Attachments:** [Springbank Draft ASPs-G2.docx](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

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

Kevin,

As my councillor would you please ensure administration gets the process right, this time?

Otherwise I will stay with my plea that this public hearing is not duly accounted for and therefore cannot proceed.

Thank you.

Gloria

---

**From:** MMitton@rockyview.ca  
**Sent:** February 15, 2021 11:16 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED] [LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca](mailto:LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca)  
**Cc:** [PCAO@rockyview.ca](mailto:PCAO@rockyview.ca)  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] - FW: Public Hearing for South Springbank ASP CANNOT proceed

Good morning Gloria,

Jessica will be mentioning in her presentation that some letters were duplicated and / or placed in only one package. If you would like to be extra sure that your letter will be read in the proper context please resend the submission to [publichearings@rockyview.ca](mailto:publichearings@rockyview.ca) after 9:00 am on Tuesday, February 16, 2021.

If you have any further questions please let us know.

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)

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:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 13, 2021 12:23 PM  
**To:** Michelle Mitton <[MMitton@rockyview.ca](mailto:MMitton@rockyview.ca)>; Legislative Services Shared <[LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca](mailto:LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca)>

**Cc:** Rocky View County Office of the CAO <[PCAO@rockyview.ca](mailto:PCAO@rockyview.ca)>; Gloria Wilkinson  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - FW: Public Hearing for South Springbank ASP CANNOT proceed

**Importance:** High

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

First email bounced. I have corrected your address.

Gloria

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** February 13, 2021 11:03 AM

**To:** mmitton@legislative services.ca

**Cc:** Gloria Wilkinson [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Public Hearing for South Springbank ASP CANNOT proceed

**Importance:** High

Good morning,

I have read in full detail all the attachments to all three public hearing scheduled for Feb. 16.

You specifically replied to my submissions and said they would be included. Shall I retrieve that email?

My letter IS NOT attached as one of the submissions in opposition to the South Springbank ASP. This makes the PH incomplete and therefore CANNOT proceed.

Gloria Wilkinson



## **Springbank ASP, North and South, Draft Prepared for First Reading**

Feedback prior to Feb. 2021 deadline:

### ***1. Technical Support documents***

#### **ISL Springbank Servicing Report, 86 pages, 2020**

Makes two *assumptions* for favorable water supply options:

1. Calgary from the reservoir at Artists View East:  
but it does not consider the relevant possibility of such a solution, since RVC has hired a third party to try to eliminate the CRMB. Calgary will not be amenable to cooperate. If Calgary should sign an agreement, what would be the annual taxpayer cost?
2. Harmony:  
but their licenses allow supply only on their own lands, clearly described in each license, and for the volumes required by that development. I do not see a system of negotiation referenced in the ISL report, nor any application to amend their licenses. I note that to even supply the Harmony development, itself, at full build-out an investment in the range of \$570 Million more capital is required. If RVC anticipates use from Harmony how much will that cost us, the current taxpayers?  
**\*\* Specifically, in the South ASP, there is a Harmony water line running east to the Rudiger lands. Again, there is no water available and no license to do this so why is something incorrect in a bylaw Document?**

No responsibility for costs were stated for taxpayers to consider! Is it fully developer cost; or is it a cost-recovery system demonstrating the same cost to us as “Balzac East” continues to be?

Therefore, it must be concluded that **neither ASP CAN proceed at this time.**

#### **MPE Report on Springbank Creek, 55 pages, 2015**

Key points from this report:

1. Clearly states, in 2015 dollars, that \$2M was required to remedy existing problems in just that one sub-basin
2. Mapping shows large areas of land that are too wet for development within the ASP boundaries, yet this report indicates even smaller parcels on less than 1 acre using private sewage. This is directly opposite the recommendation regarding pollution via wastewater drainage in both the Elbow and Bow River Watershed Reports. (see below)
3. The map on p. 9 clearly shows all the areas that will be negatively impacted by SR1 – but this report does not include that analysis

#### **MPE Master Drainage Report, 138 pages, 2016**

This appears to be a paper exercise to try to update the thorough Westhoff Report of 2004.

1. No stream gauge program has been implemented, as per the Westhoff Report, therefore RVC has no idea of TSS loads - as only one example. Without this program there is also no way to gauge outcomes from the SR1 impacts.

It also references the requirements of both the Elbow and Bow Watershed Reports.

The Watershed Reports require:

2. a limit to phosphorus loading and currently Calgary has difficulties meeting their required reduced load. How then can this massive plan meet those same conditions, as they add to the issue vs. help it?
3. Maintaining pre-development hydrology which apparently is not even done currently, since there is a need of \$2M to correct current issues

Picking up on only these three points (of the 6 in the MPE reports) it therefore must be concluded that these ASPs **CANNOT proceed at this time.**

## **2. Draft Springbank ASP, both North and South**

*Residential:*

The cluster development idea received minimal agreement by the residents to be included:

- to make sure our seniors could remain in the central part of our Springbank Community, and
- to be placed where it made topographic and access sense for them.

Instead, the ASP is proposed to cover massive areas of Springbank which is against the community feedback of only 53% even saying yes to a variety of some higher density; and of that 53% only 1/3 (18% of 53% = miniscule) wanted cluster development. Besides what wildlife corridor could exist within cluster development?

Remember that Springbank already has a 100-year supply of approved developments in a closed river basin.

**Therefore, the reports' conclusions are wrong making the reports and mapping wrong.**

*Industry:*

The concept of industrial development in the North ASP:

The clear community feedback was to allow ONLY light industry and that should be ONLY where the Springbank Airport requires residential restrictions. The feedback went on to say that only commercial development be allowed beyond those boundaries.

It is recognized that the number of industrial-acres is reduced from 946 to 469 (unless of course that is simply a conversion of the numbers).

Instead - what did the Springbank Community get? INDUSTRY!!

**Therefore, the report conclusions are wrong making the report and the mapping wrong.**

Thinking of access for developers of industry: why would they choose Springbank?

- No international airport.
- No railroad.
- Tougher and longer access to the industrial corridor in Calgary.
- Tougher and longer access to the north/south corridor of the province.

*Agriculture, in both ASPs:*

Why is it protected only “until”? Are we all going to stop eating when we live in those dastardly cluster houses covering all the agricultural land?

Additionally, without agriculture, who will be the stewards of the land in order to continue to deliver the current “full basket of environmental goods”? This stewardship situation provided by all our agriculturists also benefits all those downstream of Springbank. Isn’t that called regional planning for servicing?

*Transportation:*

The South ASP boundaries cut off Highway 1, yet Goal 8 requires attention to both Highway 1 and to RR33.

The North ASP, Goal 9, does not have specific treatments listed for intersections from the County to Highway 1. RR33 is the community centre of Springbank.

Correct the wording and mapping of both ASPs.

In particular, Highway 563 is cut off from recognition in both documents. Both maps show this provincial highway as a non-continuous entity. Wrong. It is an historical highway and should continue as such (as a matter of fact, in other documents in front of RVC – 563 being provincial – what is Qualico doing proposing multiple accesses from both Calgary and RVC, without the required distancing under provincial standards?)

Please confirm that all “notions” of a provincial highway, #563, being taken over by RVC and turned into a four-lane feeder road ARE DELETED!

*Servicing:*

The goals of both ASPs state “provide” --- “in a safe, cost effective, and sustainable manner”.

The wastewater line is incorrectly shown to tie into Pinebrook. They are connected to Calgary. There is no new agreement.

There is no Regional Plan.

The South Saskatchewan River basin has been closed since 2006.

Both the Bow and Elbow Watershed Plans prohibit runoff.

Could you please thoroughly explain how this statement can legally exist?

If it should become legal -at whose costs?

*Open Spaces:*

Both documents claim that some of the open spaces left over from cluster development would be Municipal Reserves.

Those homeowners would assume that is their space. How likely is it they would let me drive into the middle of their group to walk my dog and leave it's business behind?

So - How many more tax dollars would have to be spent to mow those MRs to control fire hazard?

Unreasonable assumption!

*Communication:*

Acton 5 in the South ASP talks about communication between RVC and developers. Developer don't pay the taxes. Where is the communication with the taxpayers – and show me when and where that communication is thoughtfully considered.

Even taking the side of a developer – tell me how dividing the franchise area for the Calalta Water service into two ASPs, with different conditions is listening to developers?

Have both ASPs been circulated to the City? What are their comments on this new divided direction? I don't see that communication on RVC website.

*Conclusion:*

All this time, energy, and money spent by the residents, the administration, the consultants, and Council has become a colossal waste by everyone. Not only is our feedback ignored but one Councillor went on to split our ONE COMMUNITY into two parts.

DEFEAT AND START AGAIN. (Or do NOTHING, as we already exist under more than one Springbank ASP.)

Respectfully,

Gloria Wilkinson