

Michelle Mitton

From: 12milecouleegroup@gmail.com
Sent: May 18, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Clarifications to developer presentation - May 18

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

Hello

The 12 Mile Coulee group is a voluntary committee of Rocky View Blueridge and Watermark residents who have come together out of concern with the developments proposed along 12 Mile Coulee Road and within our communities.

- (1) The developer has made reference to the 12 Mile Coulee Group and we confirm what the group did meet with the developer on 3 occasions.
- (2) The nature of the conversations were exploratory only and did not result in any agreement or approvals, conditional or implied by the 12 Mile Coulee Group. In fact, critical differences remain between both the group and the developer on matters such as but not limited to height, densities and bylaw changes.
- (3) The 12 Mile Coulee Group did not hold itself out as a replacement for a fulsome public review and commentary process.
- (4) The conversations did not conclude with any acceptance of changes to the Conceptual Scheme as brought before Council in this Public Hearing of May 18.
- (5) The proposed changes to the CS and bylaw are amendments as proposed by the developer only.

Thank you

Tom Dechert, Watermark Resident

12 Mile Coulee Group.

Michelle Mitton

From: JANET BALLANTYNE [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2021 10:16 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaws C-8056-2020 & 8055-2020

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

The comments on the Concept Scheme amendments from Atco Pipelines states that they require a separate utility lot for its sole use on this site. There does not appear to be any dedicated utility lot for Atco's use on the development concept maps. When and where will this be provided?

Michelle Mitton

From: JANET BALLANTYNE [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2021 11:12 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8055-2020 & C-8056-2020

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

The applicant has made a number of assertions that the proposed development will be a seniors' oriented community for 55+ residents. There is nothing in the DC bylaw that restricts ownership of apartment units to those over 55 years of age, as the applicant has asserted.

If the applicant is to be held to its assurances, there need to be substantial changes to the DC bylaw. If these are not made, what ability does RVC have to hold the applicant to the "promises" they have made during the public hearing?

As it is drafted, there is nothing to constrain ownership within the development.

Michelle Mitton

From: KW Stagg [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2021 10:45 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - PL29299951, PL20200050 Redesignation for Damkar Lands - Bylaw C-8055-2020

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

My name is Ken Stagg and I live directly adjacent to the development on the North side. 15 Blueridge place. I have a legacy that I want to leave my children. I bought my property to enjoy country living close to the city but in a low density area with nature close by. This is my legacy to my children. No different from the Damkars. Why would my desire carry any less weight?

The map showing decenters does not indicate that I oppose and I live directly adjacent to the development. Why is that?

The traffic report did not take into account our access road (Blueridge Drive) as being effected by the development. Why was it excluded? It will effect our ability to exit our community onto 12 Mile Coulee.

Ken Stagg

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Michelle Mitton

From: Peter Bannister [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - FW: Trico Development - Land use Redesignation Application for Seniors "Orientated" residential community.

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

Please see my correspondence with Samantha Wright below on the aforementioned application. She suggested forwarding it to you for consideration.

Peter Bannister

From: Samantha Wright <sam@wrightforbearspaw.com>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021, 2:06 p.m.
To: Peter Bannister
Subject: Re: Trico Development - Land use Redesignation Application for Seniors "Orientated" residential community.

Thank you for you mail, Peter.

You are correct, it is important that Council hears from its residents. As such, I want to be sure that you have submitted your email to legislativeservices@rockyview.ca so that it becomes part of the agenda package for all of council to review. If you have not already done so, please send it in.

As you know, the hearing is scheduled for May 18th. Due to the inability for the public to participate in person, due too Covid restrictions, you may also submit further comments during the public hearing. Any day of comments should be sent to publichearings@rockyview.ca.

Thanks again for taking the time to express your concerns.

Best,
Samantha

On Mon, May 10, 2021 at 11:29 AM Peter Bannister [REDACTED] wrote:

Sammantha, I am writing you as our Councilor that was elected to represents us and our concerns in Bearspaw. We live in Watermark in the designated affected area for the Application by Trico Development for a Land use Redesignation Application for Seniors "Orientated" residential community in Bearspaw along 12 mile Coulee road bordering on Watermark.

I wish to advise you of our strong objection to such a high density development in our community. We moved to Bears paw out of the City of Calgary with the explicit intent of getting away from high density developments such as this and the associated effects such as traffic etc. . We were aware of the Centre Street Church plans we purchased in Watermark, however even in this instance the scope and plans for the Church changed considerably from our initial review prior to the purchase of our home. This appears to be a game played by developers when seeking approvals and we have been dismayed by Council not taking this into consideration when issuing development permits or land use resignation. I have read Trico’s conceptual scheme development plan that is on Rockyview’s website in detail and I note again that it is footnoted numerous times within the conceptual plan presentation that what is represented is in “Concept Only – Subject to Change at the Development Permit Phase”. We have seen this “rodeo” before with the Church plans and we would like to advise you of our **strong objection** to any approval for redesignation of lands for this development for the proposed high density development on two fronts. First and foremost we do not believe that such high density development is in keeping with the atmosphere of the community of Bears paw. To suggest as they do in their proposal that somehow this is meant to serve the community of Bears paw is laughable as I am sure the vast majority of occupants will come from elsewhere outside of the community. Not everything our Council considers should be driven by tax revenues for the County of Rockyview. You were elected to represent the residents of the Community and their wishes and desires and how proposed development effects their lives, not the developers. Secondly, we also do not think Council should be approving the redesignation of Land use **without definitive plans** for development. We have seen this game before where the developer puts out a conceptual plan in order to get land use resignation and then when they apply for the development permit the plans miraculously change. At that point there is a big fight with the community over the scope and scale of the development with undue stress and time required to deal with it. I am tired of this. And do not believe it is right that effected party’s should have to be dealing with this.

In short I strongly believe that any development on the lands in question should be in keeping with the aura of the community and not the type of development you would see within the City of Calgary. It effects our quality of life and the community in which we live and pay considerable taxes in. I am sure a much more suitable and lower density development with similar objectives to what is being proposed can be undertaken. Certainly it may not provide the return on investment that Trico or any other developer may desire but quite frankly I do not care and nor should you or Council. Money is not everything and should not be driving decision making alone in Council.

I look forward to you representing the concerns of your constituents with respect to this application and I will be following it closely.

Regards;

Peter Bannister

Michelle Mitton

From: Phoebe LJY [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2021 10:39 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - We OPPOSE this proposed bylaw!

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

To whom it may concern,

I was advised that I can send our feedback here starting today.

We live in Tuscany Reserve Rise. For this proposed bylaw (Amend Land Use Bylaw C-80000-2020), our family definitely opposes it and we are very unhappy about it. Neither do my neighbours. These are the reasons:

1. It is definitely not environment-friendly. People keep destroying more greenlands and space. Back to 7 years ago when we moved in, it is nothing around, only woods and grasslands, then hundreds of houses nearby popped up, now a big church... We don't want to see any more human activities to destroy the lands. Just because there is some empty land doesn't mean it should be occupied due to human's greed.
2. The proposed new added community will add much more crowds and traffic - and more complicated human activities. Along Tuscany Reserve Rise this area, there are lots of young families with small children. Cannot imagine how this potential crowd will affect our kids' living space. And it will for sure block views for many families, although it may not affect our house view.
3. Is it really a good location for seniors residents? Just because there is a new church nearby and some mountain views doesn't mean it is convenient for seniors. As such, do you also want to build a hospital or clinics, a shopping mall (I know it is also under proposed) around in the future... The list will go on if we humans require more and don't stop. Just cannot think any further...

These are the main 3 reasons we oppose it. The only reason I can think of any benefit of using this location for some relevant stakeholders or party is to directly make more money by selling/advertising the mountain view buildings - no doubt this will be a huge selling point.

Thanks for your consideration - our goal is eventually to build a harmonious shared community, no one wants to see human-made conflicts.

Phoebe and Fei

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

From: <MMitton@rockyview.ca>
Date: Mon., May 10, 2021, 8:33 a.m.
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] - We OPPOSE this proposed bylaw!

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: <janderson@rockview.ca>

Good morning,

Thank you for your comments on the proposed bylaw, as comments closed at 4:30 pm Wednesday, May 5, 2021 your comments will not be included in the agenda.

However, if you would like your comments to be considered at the public hearing please resubmit your comments to publichearings@rockyview.ca starting at 9am on Tuesday, May 18, 2021.

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to let us know.

Thank you,

Michelle

MICHELLE MITTON, M.Sc
Legislative Officer | Legislative Services

ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

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

Phone: 403-520-1290 | 403-835-2227

MMitton@rockyview.ca | 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: Phoebe LJY [REDACTED]
Sent: May 7, 2021 9:18 PM
To: Legislative Services Shared <LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca>

Cc: janderson@rockview.ca

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - We OPPOSE this proposed bylaw!

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

To whom it may concern,

For some reason, I just got this letter today and realize it is late. But we think it is better late than never ever speak up.

We live in Tuscany Reserve Rise. For this proposed bylaw (Amend Land Use Bylaw C-80000-2020), our family definitely opposes it and we are very unhappy about it. Neither do my neighbours. These are the reasons:

1. It is definitely not environment-friendly. People keep destroying more greenlands and space. Back to 7 years ago when we moved in, it is nothing around, only woods and grasslands, then hundreds of houses nearby popped up, now a big church... We don't want to see any more human activities to destroy the lands. Just because there is some empty land doesn't mean it should be occupied due to human's greed.

2. The proposed new added community will add much more crowds and traffic - and more complicated human activities. Along Tuscany Reserve Rise this area, there are lots of young families with small children. Cannot imagine how this potential crowd will affect our kids' living space. And it will for sure block views for many families, although it may not affect our house view.

3. Is it really a good location for seniors residents? Just because there is a new church nearby and some mountain views doesn't mean it is convenient for seniors. As such, do you also want to build a hospital or clinics, a shopping mall (I know it is also under proposed) around in the future... The list will go on if we humans require more and don't stop. Just cannot think any further...

These are the main 3 reasons we oppose it. The only reason I can think of any benefit of using this location for some relevant stakeholders or party is to directly make more money by selling/advertising the mountain view buildings - no doubt this will be a huge selling point.

Thanks for your consideration - our goal is eventually to build a harmonious shared community, no one wants to see human-made conflicts.

