

Kristen Tuff

From: Robert Bartlett [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:01 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared; Michelle Mitton; Oksana Newmen; Legislative Services Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Proposed Redesignation and Development of Fawn Hills Bragg Creek

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

Proposed Redesignation and Development of Fawn Hills Drive , Bragg Creek

PL201901 and PL20190103

Dear Legislative Services,

I am contacting you in STRONG opposition to the proposed redesignation and development of Fawn Hills Drive, Bragg Creek.

As a West Bragg Creek resident, I feel this development, at 22 homes, is completely inappropriate for our community largely based on it's SIZE.

We do not presently have proper INFRASTRUCTURE to support it:

TRAFFIC CONCERNS

Adding another 20 to 40 vehicles per day to the already overburdened West Bragg Road (twp 232) would be unmanageable, especially

weekends when the road already sees LARGE numbers of users accessing the West Bragg recreational trail head.

ACCESS / EGRESS

Having sat on the FIRE SMART committee for a number of years, I am very aware of the extreme WILDFIRE risk in our community.

(We have been petitioning for an emergency exit road for a number of years without success.) Currently there is only one road out

and one bridge. Adding another 22 homes only increases the very real difficulties and dangers of evacuating the area in an emergency.

No large development should go in until this very important problem has been addressed.

WATER / SEWAGE

I don't believe a large , 22 lot development should involve septic tanks and individual wells.

Again, It is far too big a development for this strategy. There is a good chance that many fields will put local residents and the environment

at risk.

Surely, it does not meet county standards in this regard.

Also, I am concerned the wetland / Bragg Creek TRIBUTARY in the area will be negatively impacted.

STRUCTURE PLAN / ASP

To the best of my knowledge, this proposal "only just" adheres to our LOCAL STRUCTURE PLAN.

In addition, its high density sets an unwanted precedent for future development in our community, and is not supported by the ASP.

Please refuse this inappropriate and poorly conceived proposal.

Sincerely,

Rob and Rosemary Bartlett

Legal Land description: SW section 09 Township 25 Range 05 West of 05 Lot 12 Block 1 Plan 802 02 70

Looks good to me.



Looks good, thank you.

Yes, please proceed.

ReplyReply allForward

Kristen Tuff

From: Doug Brennan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - March 23rd Council Meeting - Land Use Change (Redesignation) C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and Conceptual Scheme C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

Submitted by:
Doug Brennan
Resident of 120 Fawn Hills Drive
and
President of Fawn Hills (North) Water Coop

Both the Land Use Change and Conceptual scheme noted above must be rejected.

As correctly identified by the Planning Department this development proposal fails to meet several very basic and critically important requirements set out in the Area Structure Plan and Rockyview County's basic Servicing Standards.

1. The number of lots proposed should be limited to 5 based on the Density and Gross Developable Area Calculation (8% slope) or 12 lots (15% slope). A proposal of 22 is ludicrous. The developer is clearly aware of the required calculation, however they have completely ignored it.
2. The failure to provide a detailed commitment to a communal water distribution system is the second example of the developer ignoring a clear requirement of the ASP. The RISA conclusion states "As all developments will be dependent on good sources of water, and without a prospective servicing arrangement for this policy area, it is prudent that the MD acquire better information about this important resource." The ASP requirement of a communal water system is critically important so Rockyview taxpayers are not, once again, saddled with costs to make it right at a later date.
3. To avoid any potential confusion I am confirming The Fawn Hills (North) Water Coop has no interest in and cannot support any additional development. Our system was designed, built and maintained to service the current number of homes. In addition, it is important that all parties be aware if required, we will defend our rights under the Water Act and Priority Listing of "First in Time, First in Right". The University-County Groundwater Monitoring Program has shown conclusively that only spring rains over a period of time are the primary contributor to the aquifer recharge specifically in the Fawn Hills valley. A development on the west hillside will certainly impact the aquifer recharge and potentially our water quality. At this point there is no evidence of what those impacts might be.
4. The failure to provide a detailed commitment to a wastewater treatment system is another blatant disregard of the ASP and is very concerning to our Fawn Hills (North) Water Coop as our well draws from the lowlands in the valley. As mentioned above the spring rains recharge the aquifer and would be travelling through the individual septic fields on route to the lowlands.
5. The failure to require the developer to meet the basic Servicing Standard of pavement for Range Road 52, Fawn Hills Drive and any internal roadway would simply leave Rockyview Taxpayers with the cost of meeting the Servicing Standard set by Rockyview County.

6. As identified by Planning, the technical matters of Slope Stability and One Acre Developable Area Assessment are clearly important issues, however they are moot points until the "table stakes" of an appropriate number of lots, detailed water/sewage facilities and paved roadways are all ensured.
7. It seems very little consideration has been given to the natural environment section of the ASP. Article 5.1.2 states "Environmental Reserve **shall** (emphasis added) be dedicated to preserve and maintain habitat and natural connectivity between riparian edges and upland forested areas." This is both very surprising and concerning as the proposal impacts lands that are almost exclusively directly between the riparian edge and the upland forest. It does not allow for natural connectivity and most certainly does not maintain habitat. This clearly falls short of "Environmental Reserve **shall** (emphasis added) be dedicated...".
8. Although the need to inform the Tsuu Tina was identified by Planning I do not know if they received appropriate notice/consultation (many of us on Fawn Hills Drive did not receive notice - as Rockyview Councilors have been previously notified via email by myself). The Tsuu Tina land meets the North West corner of the proposed development and blocking the natural connectivity between the riparian edges and the upland forest will most certainly impact the ability of wildlife to travel through to the Tsuu Tina lands.
9. In regard to evacuation concerns I note the developer proposes access at both the north and south end of their development. Unfortunately each access would connect onto Fawn Hills Drive. The south entrance would allow everyone from the proposed development to access Fawn Hills Drive at a point closer to Range Road 52 and therefore ahead of all current Fawn Hills (North) Water Coop members. Personally, I do not feel good about sitting behind an additional 22 or maybe 44 vehicles while we try to evacuate onto Range Road 52 and then West Bragg Creek.

In closing, please follow the guidance of your Planning and various other departments in rejecting this application. It clearly does not meet the requirements of the ASP or Rockyview's basic Servicing Standards which were created through the significant efforts of many committed individuals with professional expertise.

Respectfully submitted.

Kristen Tuff

From: Anne B Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:29 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Fwd: C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

Subject: C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

To Members of Council,

My name is Anne Brown and I live at 96 Fawn Hills Drive.

I am writing to inform Council that I am completely opposed to the re-designation and conceptual scheme under review at today's hearing.

I have previously written to the RVC Planning Dept. stating my position but would like to add the following concerns:

It is well known that the land in question is already subject to flooding in the valley where wetland lies. This flooding not only impacts the driveway on the easement that leads to the quarter-section to the west, but also gets dangerously close to flooding Range Road 52 on an almost yearly basis in the spring or after an intensely rainy season which occurs quite frequently and more so in recent years. The removal of a portion of the forest which would be necessary for the subdivision to go ahead, will only serve to exacerbate this situation. Intact forest slows the speed of surface water, allowing more time for the ground to absorb the excess. Without the trees, flooding will increase. This is well-documented and without question.

Last fall, the land-owner removed enough trees and leveled the ground, creating a cut-line much wider than a normal driveway would be, from north to south completely through the property. This is obviously intended to be the road through the subdivision. Lots have been staked out and some clearing has already occurred in those spots. I am already deeply concerned how this will affect run-off in the coming rainy seasons, let alone what the removal of even more forest will do if 22 lots are given the go-ahead to be cleared. This would be a lot of forest on a hill, no longer present to aid in the prevention of flooding.

My next concern is in regards to the wording in the proposal around availability of water which reads 'likely enough water for most of the houses'. That does not reassure me that the developer can say with conviction that the water supply is ample. I also worry that by adding 22 homes to the valley that the North Fawn Hills Water Co-op will be adversely affected. The Co-op has a Water License from Alberta Environment which could mean that no other wells are allowed in the valley. Surely this should be confirmed prior to development anyways.

Finally, I would like to address an inaccuracy in Bart Cardwell's response to the concerns of residents. He states that 'The wetland where the pond exists was purchased from Alberta Environment' which

is not true. Alberta Environment has not purchased this area. His response offers no understanding of the wetland area. He needs to be better informed.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to have my views included at this public hearing. I urge Councillor Mark Kamachi and all of Council to turn down this proposal completely.

Sincerely,

Anne Brown

Kristen Tuff

From: David NA Cebuliak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 1:38 PM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

This is the first we have heard about the disc golf idea. We OPPOSE this completely.

Anne Brown and David Cebuliak

96, Fawn Hills Drive

Kristen Tuff

From: Dean Cockshutt [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 1:07 PM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re; C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)
Attachments: Fawn Hills Development Proposal Comments.pdf

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

Dear Sirs.

Attached is a document explaining my concerns on the Proposed Fawn Hills development. I await a response from the Proponents on these key concerns.

Thank you.

Dean Cockshutt
77 Meadow View Road
Bragg Creek, Alberta
T0L 0K0

Dean Cockshutt

March 23, 2021

Re; Land use re-designation C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and conceptual scheme C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

Dear sirs

I am a 30 year resident of west Bragg Creek and I am not anti-development as long as the proposed developments meet the ASP requirements and will not have negative impacts on existing residents. Before I can support the subject land use re-designation and conceptual scheme, I respectfully request answers to the concerns listed below;

Fresh Water Supply Source, Distribution and Impacts to Existing Communal Well

- What is the peak and average daily potable water requirement for the Proposal?
- Section 4.7 and Section 5.12 state *“To conclude, the Phase 1 study found sufficient aquifer supplies **should** exist for the proposal. Water would **likely be able** to be supplied at rates, as defined in the Water Act, without causing adverse affects to existing domestic, traditional agricultural or licensed groundwater users in the area. Recharge to aquifers by surface water sources and precipitation in this area **should** serve to make aquifer supplies sustainable.”*
- The cited previous water source consulting reports need to be made available for study to support these conclusions. The provided water flow rate estimated range of 1.5 to 10.5 igpm demonstrates the authors really do not know what rate a new well will flow at. How was this estimate arrived at and with what confidence level?
- The geologic cross section shown in Figure 9 is a warning that nothing can be assumed when drilling water wells in the Plan area. There is not a single water bearing strata that can be correlated well to well on this cross section so how can the author conclude anything about water flow rates, recharge or impact of water withdrawals to the existing well?
- The Proposal states that *“Bedrock strata in this area are predominantly shales of Wapiti and Fernie formation that have undergone thrust faulting leading to a fracture network for groundwater pathways.”* WBC residents have experienced extremely variable water quality and quantity results when drilling wells for this exact reason. Some houses have wells exceeding 150 ft in depth and some just 500 yards away are only 50 ft. Some wells have very high iron content and some don't. Only a few wells have high flow rates and it is very common for home owners to install cisterns because their wells cannot support normal peak daily demands. These variable results are caused by the faulted and fractured formations and it cannot be assumed that a new well will be of sufficient quality and flow rate for one house much less 20.
- It should be remembered that Figure 31 “Communal Water” is only a concept. There is no certainty that the concept wells will provide the needed water supply or will be at the concept locations. What if a water well of sufficient quality and quantity cannot be found on the Plan area?

- Will the potable water be treated at a central pump house to remove iron and will the water be chlorinated?
- Will a new water supply well be drilled and tested to determine suitable flow rates, quality and negative impacts on the existing communal well before granting Proposal approval?
- Has the existing Fawn Hill communal well(s) ever shown a chronic lowering of the water level or shown any other anecdotal evidence of declining recharge?
- If the two conceptual wells of the Proposal are drilled up dip and in the path of subterranean water recharging the existing communal well(s), what is the expected impact on water recharge on the existing supply well(s)?

Light Pollution

- WBC is well known by the residents for it's "dark skies" that are free from light pollution. Star gazers can experience skies that are dark enough to view and photograph celestial bodies that cannot be seen in more developed areas.
- The Proposal will result in 20 lighted houses and yards. There will be many more vehicles with headlights. Combined this will create light pollution. Can the Proponents explain how dark sky viewing in Fawn Hills will be impacted?
- Section 5.4.3 notes that house designs will utilize Dark Sky recommended lighting, but the Proponents cannot control what lighting individual landowners install. What covenants will be placed on the Proposal home owners adding new lighting?

Wildlife Impacts

- There does not appear to be any wildlife surveys or discussions of impacts on wildlife in the Proposal.
- Are there any wildlife corridors through the existing lot and have the new impacts of the subdivision been studied?
- The existing meadow is an important ungulate feed area. How will ungulates be impacted?
- Are there any endangered species in the Plan area?

Sufficiency of Utilities

- Is there enough electrical power and natural gas flowing into WBC to service 20 more houses without an upgrade to the existing utilities that run along WBC road? Will any upgrades increase the utility rates of present WBC residents?
- Where will the above ground electrical service line run?

Snow Removal

- Who pays for removing snow from the road through the development so that school buses can make it through safely? Will it become a county maintained road or private like Saddle and Sirloin?

Visual Impacts

- What assurances do you have that after a road is built and the land scarred that the development will proceed?
- Are there any architectural covenants on the house designs?

- Will subdivision rules / covenants allow RV's to be parked on the subdivision road or in the front yards of the new houses? This can become an eyesore.

Kristen Tuff

From: Jacky Kelly [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:51 AM
To: Legislative Services Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Fwd: Division 1 Bylaw C-7955-2019 Conceptual Scheme Fawn Hills of Bragg Creek

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

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jacky Kelly
Date: March 22, 2021 at 4:21:08 PM MDT
To: legislativeservices@rockyview.ca
Subject: Division 1 Bylaw C-7955-2019 Conceptual Scheme Fawn Hills of Bragg Creek

For file: PL 20190103 (03915824),

Name: Jackaleen Kelly, address is 81 Fawn Hills Drive,

I am Opposed and Against, the conceptual scheme as it has been prepared. It shows No respect for the neighbours on Fawn Hills Drive who have lived and enjoyed the area for many years and which the same can't be said of Mr Hudye who has done very little to improve the property, nor made a home of his own there. And for ourselves who reside on the quarter section that is adjoining to the west of this concept plan, no regard has been given for the impact it will have on us. We have an easement through Mr Hudye's property that was granted to us by the previous owner and is legally still in effect. This is the one and only access into our property and has been used and maintained by us only for many years. NO mention of this appears on the plan, it seems to be of no consequence.

I am not against development of the property, I certainly realize that there are many who would enjoy country living and change is inevitable but it has to be done with intelligence, thoughtful care for the existing neighbourhood, and the all important impact on water systems, which this plan is lacking.

Sincerely and trusting that the right decision will be made,
Jackaleen Kelly

Sent from my iPad

Kristen Tuff

From: Dave Kunz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 11:25 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102),C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

Dear Rocky View Council,

Re: C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102),C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103) Fawn Hills proposal.

We are concerned that this hearing is just a formality in the eyes of the developer, as they have already cleared a large number of trees and as well built a road on the property.

Dave and Kate Kunz
#48 Fawn Hills

I have attached a photograph of the property



Kristen Tuff

From: Eric Lloyd [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:05 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaws C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103) March 23, 2021 Hearing

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

Dear Rocky View County Council,

I am emailing to provide my feedback on the subject matter as a resident of Rocky View County (RVC) in West Bragg Creek.

I am against approval of the subject applications given the numerous reasons that have been identified by the RVC Planning Department and Bragg Creek area residents (see item 3 below), as well as the 2 additional reasons outlined below (items 1 & 2):

1) The subject applications do not comply with section 5.1.2 of the RVC GBCASP Bylaw which states:

"5.1.2 Wildlife a) The resource inventory and sensitivity analysis assumes that wildlife movement occurs within the undisturbed natural areas that link upland vegetation with riparian areas. In order to preserve and maintain opportunities for wildlife movements throughout the Plan area and to minimize fragmentation of the natural environment by providing contiguous habitat, environmental reserve shall be dedicated to preserve and maintain habitat and natural connectivity between riparian edges and upland forested areas."

This mandatory requirement is not met in the applications, as connectivity is not provided between the riparian area on the east side and the uplands on the west side of the site by dedication of environmental reserve.

2) Proposed construction on the extensive area of steep slopes that are well documented in the applications is a potential legal liability to RVC if the slopes prove to be unstable over the long term. There are a number of regional examples of how expensive this can prove to be for the approving municipality including the Glen Eagles development in Cochrane, Alberta.

3) The subject applications do not comply with the RVC GBCASP Bylaw and RVC servicing standards as follows:

- The number of lots (22) exceeds that allowed under the Gross Developable Area provision (12),
- The steep slopes, wetlands and riparian lands are not protected as Environmental Reserve with a required buffer and there is no Biophysical Assessment to identify those lands,
- There is no Environmental Impact Assessment to identify such resources and strategies to mitigate environmental impacts,
- There is no communal water treatment and distribution system and no municipally approved waste water treatment system,
- There is no upgrading of Fawn Hills Drive and RR52 to meet RVC servicing standards,
- There is no secondary emergency access, which is required and a public safety concern, given the high wildfire risk in the area,

Given the aforementioned non compliance with RVC requirements, these applications should be refused.

You should be aware that the applicant has already completed construction of most of the proposed subdivision road as per the attached Google map. This would appear to be putting the cart ahead of the horse in terms of proper process for approvals. A RVC Development Permit is required for such road construction under the "stripping, filling, excavation and grading" section of the Land Use Bylaw. The required Development Permit for this road construction doesn't appear to have been issued by RVC.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my feedback on this matter.

Respectively,

Eric Lloyd

Bragg Creek, AB T0L0K0

7:33 PM Sun Mar 14



Search here



Fawn Hills Dr

Google

Kristen Tuff

From: Debbie Maclean [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:17 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Input on C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) and C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

Letter to Rockyview County Council

Re:

Land use change (redesignation): **C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102)**

Conceptual scheme (the plan/document): **C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)**

For input at the March 23 council meeting

I have great empathy for the existing residents of Fawn Hills, should this land redesignation and development proposal proceed. The Fawn Hills area is a beautiful oasis that has remained as such for decades. Change is hard, but it is not a reason to oppose a potential development. Many of the arguments I have heard from other local residents, though deeply held and heartfelt, generally lack substance (increased traffic, wildlife corridor disruption, noise and others).

Therefore, opposition must be based on clear and substantial evidence and rationale. Here is mine:

- Based on the full 75 acre property, the density of lots exceeds the recommendations of the Bragg Creek ASP
- When you deduct the area that is on steep ground, and therefore not developable, the density of lots immensely exceeds the recommendations of the Bragg Creek ASP
- A single route of access and egress is insufficient for this number of lots, per the Bragg Creek ASP
- Riparian areas and steep slopes have not been allocated the appropriate level of protection, per the Bragg Creek ASP
- The proposal offers no clarity around the infrastructure for water sources and wastewater treatment – both are critical to the success of any development

There are other reasons for refusing the redesignation and the conceptual scheme, based more on possible outcomes than on evidence, but nonetheless worthy of consideration:

- If a proposal that clearly fails to meet area structure plan recommendations and requirements is approved, the precedent then exists to do the same with other such proposals.
- The plan outlines a future development site in the southeast portion of the property. This looks to be an attempt at incremental development that would put greater pressure on the local environment. There is also reference to roads connecting land parcels to the south and the west which may well gain development approval on similar grounds as the current proposal. Taken as a whole, this may well create a significant development area spawned by a single initial approval. This would radically change the character of the region.

- In my opinion, no significant development should be approved in either West or North Bragg Creek until a second emergency egress is completed. Doing so endangers an increasing number of people and makes crisis evacuation that much more complex

While I support modest and reasonable development in the Bragg Creek area, I am not in favour of the land use redesignation or the conceptual scheme as outlined in the proposal in question. I strongly urge the RVC council to reject it as it is too far off the mark set by the existing ASP.

Peter Tucker

82 Elk Willow Rd

Bragg Creek

Kristen Tuff

From: Greg Potter [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 1:41 PM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-7955-2019 (Project PL20190102) / C-7956-2019 (Project PL20190103)

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

As an area resident I object to the approval of any significant subdivisions in the West Bragg Creek area until secondary egress for the West Bragg Creek area has been put in place. During the 2013 floods West Bragg Creek was inaccessible for a number of days due to the single access point over the Elbow River bridge being out of service very graphically demonstrating the risk that this situation poses to our community. The West Bragg Creek area is one of the highest wild fire hazard zones in the province. Adding another 22 residences to West Bragg Creek with no secondary emergency egress would be a reckless and irresponsible action verging on negligence in my opinion.

Best Regards,
Greg Potter
31 Elk Valley Gate
Bragg Creek, AB
[REDACTED]

Kristen Tuff

From: Randall Provost [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Fwd: Division 1 Bylaws C-7956-2019 C-7955-2019 C-8000-2020 Conceptional Scheme- Fawn Hills of Bragg Creek.

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

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Randall Provost
Date: March 22, 2021 at 6:39:15 PM MDT
To: legislativeservices@rockyview.ca
Subject: Division 1 Bylaws C-7956-2019 C-7955-2019 C-8000-2020 Conceptional Scheme- Fawn Hills of Bragg Creek.

Regarding applications #PL20190103(file 03915024)and #PL20190103(file 03915024) I would like to submit the following. My name is Randall Provost and address is 81 Fawn Hills Drive Bragg Creek and I own jointly with my wife Jackaleen Kelly the quarter section (NW 15-23-5-5) directly to the West of the lands that the Conceptual Scheme proposes for development. I am withdrawing and cancelling my letter dated February 26, 2020 supporting the Conceptional Scheme for Fawn Hills Development Application #PL20190103 and Change of Land Use #PL2019010 and to be clear I am now against both of these applications. We have an easement on the development property upon which we constructed a road 27 years ago at our sole cost and have maintained it solely. It our only legal access to our property. We have yet to be consulted on what the impact will be to our private road access and in the last quarter of 2020 a road was punched through the proposed development area directly joining our road without notice or discussion. Additionally trees have been felled across our road in the last 6 months with no notice or warning creating an unsafe condition for us coming or going. I agree with the analysis the Rockyview Administration have prepared regarding density, water issues, and road conditions and therefore in conclusion I am against these proposals. Respectfully submitted, Randall Provost

Sent from my iPad

Kristen Tuff

From: Andrea Sparkes [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Proposed Fawn Hills Development (PL20190102 Redesignation and PL20190103 Conceptual Scheme)

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

Honourable Councilors:

Thank you for inviting our participation in this Public Hearing. We appreciate the work you do and recognize yours is not an easy job. There is a lot to consider here but the Planning Department has done good work in finding areas of deficiency.

We listened carefully to the developer's submission this afternoon. We note the following:

1. The decision cannot be made on a comparison between the east and west neighbourhoods because the east development pre-dates the ASP by decades.
2. The neighbours were **not consulted** about a potential Disc Golf Facility. As expressed in the past, we do not want our neighbourhood to be any sort of "destination".
3. The restrictive covenant on the land does not displace a need for a Landscape Plan as it can be removed outside of Rocky View's control. Further, it is not sufficiently expansive to cover all matters a Landscape Plan would address (and may indeed interfere with some of the developer's plans).

Andrea Sparkes

Fawn Hills Resident