

From: [Tavis Rusnack](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Division 4 - Bylaw C8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Areas Structure Plan)
Date: June 29, 2021 9:03:41 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

To: Whom it may concern

Re: Division 4 - Bylaw C8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Areas Structure Plan)

My name is Tavis Rusnack, I am a resident in the Rocky View County and own 25 acres that borders the east edge of the Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan. I am **strongly in support** of this plan going ahead as this will do many positive things for the area and the County.

As a resident of Rocky View County, I feel this Shepard Industrial Area would greatly improve the County. There would be an extensive influx of tax revenue the County could generate off this area in the tens of millions. The tax dollars would go improving Schools in which my children attend, enhancing roads I travel every day and improving our community centers. I also own land about 6 miles east of the CN intermodal yard and industrial park in Conrich that was developed several years ago. We have seen minimal impacts with heavy truck traffic, noise and light pollution etc. Therefore, having another one of these Industrial areas in our County would not hurt. The area it is being proposed has more farm land and less residences than what is in place the community of Conrich.

Currently most of this proposed area is being farmed. The areas that are not being farmed is due to the poor quality of the land. If this Area structure plan were to get approved and go ahead, we would see an increase in the value of our property as well as the land surrounding it. The road system would be upgraded, the water in the area would be better controlled by designed ditches and ponds. The unfarmable land that sits there vacant would have a new purpose as it would be graded and made usable whether it be a wetland, a pond or a usable Industrial lot. There noting but positive outcomes from a structure plan like this.

In closing **I am in support** of the Shepard Area Structure Plan as it extremely beneficial not only for the area but the County as a whole.

Thank you.

NW-14-23-28-W4
Lot 4 Block 3 Plan 0815054

Tavis Rusnack - CPESC



From: [Blair Rusnack](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Division 4 - Bylaw C8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Areas Structure Plan)
Date: June 29, 2021 9:05:10 AM

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

To: Whom it may concern

My name is Blair Rusnack, I own 25 acres on the east edge of the Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan. **I am strongly in support** of this proposed structure plan going ahead as it will have nothing but positive effects on the area and the County.

I feel this Shepard Industrial Area would have positive affects the County. There would be an immense amount of tax revenue generated by this for the County. The tax dollars would go to improving roads and improving our overall community. Have more Commercial/Industrial Tax revenue will help keep the residential taxes lower as well.

If this Area structure plan goes ahead, there would be an increase in the value of our property as well as the land surrounding it. The road system would be improved, the designed ditches and ponds would control the water in the area. The unfarmable areas would be developed into usable industrials lots or storm ponds or manmade wetlands. Businesses who use the rail line to ship and receive products would flock to this area due to its close proximity.

In closing **I am in support** of the Shepard Area Structure Plan.

Regards

NW-14-23-28-W4
Lot 3 Block 3 Plan 0815054

Blair Rusnack

From: [Dustin Rusnack](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Division 4 - Bylaw C8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Areas Structure Plan)
Date: June 29, 2021 9:15:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

To: Whom it may concern

RE: Division 4 - Bylaw C8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Areas Structure Plan)

I am a member in a family who jointly owns the parcels of land at NW-14-23-28-W4 Lot 4 Block 3 Plan 0815054. These parcels of land are located directly on the east side of the land proposed to be the Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan. I am writing to voice my position with respect to the proposed land use redesignation for this area and the proposed Shepard Industrial ASP.

I would like to State that I am **strongly in favor** of the Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan.

Regards,

Dustin Rusnack



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From: [Allen, Peter](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Cc: [Allen, Peter](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Division 4 - Bylaw C-8172-2021
Date: June 29, 2021 9:15:26 AM
Importance: High

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

Peter Allen

Division 4 - Bylaw C-8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan)

RE: Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan

I am one of 3 brothers who jointly own the parcel land NW 2-23-28 W4M. The registered owner of NE 2-23-28 W4M is the estate of Murray Charles Colwell. The executor of the estate is Patrick Colwell. These parcels of land are located immediately east of the land covered by the proposed Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan (the "Shepard Industrial ASP"). On behalf of my brothers and on behalf of my cousin, Patrick Colwell, (collectively the "Allen-Colwell Group") I am writing to notify you of our position with respect to the proposed land use resignation for this area and the proposed Shepard Industrial ASP.


We would like to register that we **strongly favour** the Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan.

With our province struggling economically on a number of fronts, it is incumbent upon our business and political leadership to work together to diversify our economy and make the most of the opportunities that arise. I strongly believe CP's proposed new intermodal should be looked upon as an opportunity for the Rockyview County and Alberta. The capital being spent, infrastructure, tax revenue, short and long-term employment resulting from such a project are the obvious benefits provided. The trickle down benefits resulting from the road upgrades and drainage necessary for development will help Shepard become a long-term location of economic benefit for both residences and land owners alike.

Our land is 3rd generation land and we come from a farming background, so we do understand the sentiment of other land owners who are resisting change. I however believe that growth east of Calgary is inevitable and given our current economic circumstances, there is no time like the present to show the rest of the province, Canada and the world, that Calgary and its surrounding regions are motivated, progressive, open for business and can get projects approved and done in a timely manner. Many fellow Albertans complain of the federal obstructionist policies of Ottawa and other provinces. Well, here is a made in Alberta idea and opportunity and I think is incumbent upon us to live up to our self-billing as Open For Business.

Regards,

Peter Allen



Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with “UNSUBSCRIBE” in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc [REDACTED] in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email:
[REDACTED]

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

Le respect de votre vie privée et de vos préférences pour les communications électroniques est important pour nous. Si vous ne souhaitez plus que je vous envoie des courriels, veuillez répondre en inscrivant « DÉSABONNER » dans la ligne d’objet ou dans le corps de votre message. Si vous ne voulez non plus recevoir des courriels de notre société, veuillez indiquer : [REDACTED] » en copie conforme (Cc) dans votre réponse. Veuillez toutefois noter que vous continuerez de recevoir des messages liés aux opérations effectuées ou aux services que nous vous fournissons. Si vous avez des questions sur la façon dont sera géré votre préférence, veuillez nous les envoyer par courriel, à l’adresse [REDACTED]

Ce courrier électronique est confidentiel et protégé. L’expéditeur ne renonce pas aux droits et obligations qui s’y rapportent. Toute diffusion, utilisation ou copie de ce message ou des renseignements qu’il contient par une personne autre que le (les) destinataire(s) désigné(s) est interdite. Si vous recevez ce courrier électronique par erreur, veuillez m’en aviser immédiatement, par retour de courrier électronique ou par un autre moyen.

From: [Jay German](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Shepard letter of support
Date: June 29, 2021 9:36:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Shepard letter of support.docx](#)

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

Jay German

Vice President, Land Development



250, 5920 - 1A Street SW | Calgary, AB | T2H 0G3
C. 403.993.0588 | P. 403.692.4642 | F. 403.255.2516
www.ronmor.ca



June 29, 2021

MD of Rockyview
262075 Rocky View Point, AB
T4A 0X2

Division 4 - Bylaw C-8172-2021 - Adoption of Proposed Bylaw C-8172-2021 (Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan)

Ronmor is in support of the Shepard Industrial Area ASP. Ronmor manages over 1,200 acres north of the Shepard ASP and is knowledgeable of the details of this ASP.

Legal addresses of Ronmor's land holdings as follows:

NE 1/4 27 23 28	NW 1/4 26 23 28 W4
SE 34 23 28 4	NW 1/4 26 23 28 W4
SW 34 23 28 4	SW 1/4 21 23 28 W4
NE 34 23 28 4	
NW 34 23 28 4	

SW 1/4 34 23 28 W4b

Sincerely,

Jay German
Vice President, Land
Ronmor Holdings Ltd.
Cell: (403) 993-0588
Email: jgerman@ronmor.ca

From: [Gary Sutherland](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Cc: [Candace Vanin; Al Merlo;](#) [REDACTED] [Legislative Services Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8172-2021 – Draft Shepard Industrial Area Structure Plan
Date: June 29, 2021 9:17:30 AM

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

Dear Reeve and Council,

My name is Gary Sutherland and I am the land owner of SW-16-23-28-W04 within the proposed Shepard Industrial ASP.

I am AGAINST the second reading of this bylaw until major corrections and errors/omissions are rectified.

I also request Rocky View County [RVC] Council direct administration & the developer to amend, correct and clarify the future progress AND process for this proposed Draft Shepard Industrial ASP [SIASP] dated June 11, 2021, ver 8 including working effectively with the City of Calgary in future and a full review and update of the 2011 Shepard Regional Drainage Plan.

Despite a multitude of attempts to discuss and provide documented landowners' feedback & corrections of errors/omissions to the proponents in December, January and February 24th open house; NONE have been taken into account by the developer, nor RVC planning staff.

The Executive Summary [para 1, pg 132 of 372 of the agenda package] falsely states that amendments have been made "taking into account feedback from stakeholders" and throughout refers to the SIASP as the "Shepard ASP" which is a gross misrepresentation of another existing RVC statutory plan.

This draft SIASP is riddled with other errors or omissions & they include:

Map 1 Plan Area [pg 10 / pg 162 of 372 of agenda pkg] - map incorrectly identifies the area of interest in the map's legend as the Shepard ASP - this should be corrected to "draft RVC Shepard Industrial ASP"

-Administration and developers need to clearly distinguish between existing statutory plans:

- a) the RVC Shepard ASP [2001/ 2014] on SE-08-23-28-W04
- b) the City of Calgary's Shepard Industrial ASP [2009]
- c) the draft RVC Shepard Industrial ASP [under review]

Map 3 Site Analysis [pg 13 / pg 165 of 372 of agenda pkg] - correction needed to acknowledge historical drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04

-failure to acknowledge drainage ditch is serious omission within Section 5: Shepard Context on pg 12, para. 4 refers to Map 3 in regards to topography and surface hydrology

-at the open house on Feb 24/21, stakeholders identified the drainage ditch as a major drainage outlet or outfall for the entire west half of the proposed Shepard Industrial ASP

Pages 16-18 - all red-lined - with no policy context from other plans, no alignment with RVC's new

MDP or existing IDP with City of Calgary

Map 6 Land Use Concept Map [pg 20 & 21] - map incorrectly identifies the area of interest in the map's legend as the Shepard ASP - this should be corrected to "draft RVC Shepard Industrial ASP"

-feedback from stakeholders about additional commercial lots has not been considered by the developer nor included in the Land Use Type Chart on pg 20

-the map shows only the developer's land with commercial development identified

-map does NOT show existing & historical PFRA drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04; this was identified, and discussed with the developers & county administration during the open house on Feb 24/21 and other meetings in January'21

-the drainage ditch is critical for local AND REGIONAL hydrology, water conveyance and flood protection, integral with the Chestermere to Shepard Slough complex & Shepard Regional Drainage system

-the drainage ditch is historical [it was constructed same time as the Langdon ditches in the 1950's], and for 70 years has effectively drained the entire draft SIASP areas identified as M1, M2-A & M2-B areas in Map 6 [and Local Plan Area A and C in Map 12]

-the SIASP's stormwater management technical report also omitted this drainage ditch, which is a serious error that needs correction to accurately reflect pre-development conditions

-the SIASP's environmental technical report DOES acknowledge the drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 and refers to the wetland areas as ER, not MR - this discrepancy in the SIASP needs to be corrected

-failure by the developer to acknowledge the drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 in the draft SIASP and fully assess the pre-development conditions in the stormwater management technical report is a serious error/omission and as such, any future development within the proposed SIASP will result in irreversible changes to drainage and surface run-off, negatively impacting over 50% of the land area within the Shepard Industrial ASP and all users downstream

Pg 22 - Three major development areas are described as the North area, the SE area and the SW area.

-the description of the three major development areas is different from what is displayed in Map 6 on pg 21 and different from the Local Plans map #12.

-the Flex lot configurations will be challenging to service from a transportation or utility servicing standpoint

Pg 23 - #6. Stormwater and Wetland Conservation and Enhancement - a storm pond system is not needed because of the existing drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 that has historically drained the wetlands on SW-16 and NW-09 into the Shepard catchment area and west of the SIASP.

-the SIASP's stormwater management technical report must be corrected to acknowledge this drainage ditch in order to properly and accurately "shape the further specification for run-off".

-the SIASP's stormwater management technical report used run-off values and coefficients from the 2011 Shepard Regional Drainage Plan that have never been verified or approved

-as the City of Calgary specified in their letter against this draft SIASP, the Shepard Regional Drainage Plan was never officially approved and should not be relied upon as the drainage solution for the SIASP.

Section 7: Industrial [pg 25] - the overview refers to Map 2 of the Rocky View County Plan - this needs to be corrected as Map 2 is the Parcels Index map on pg 11.

- the MDP Growth Concept map was Fig 3 but has been red-lined because the new MDP has not been approved

- the reference to the Parcels Index map has nothing to do with Industrial policies nor Employment Areas mentioned on pg 25

- because the reference to Map 2 is inaccurate, as stated above, the policies have serious errors/omissions and corrections are needed.

- the policies listed in 7.1 to 7.4 are more of a description of the proposed lot sizes and offer no policy context regarding servicing requirements, environmental considerations, set-backs, transportation, etc.

Section 8 [pg 28]: Heavy Industrial - entire section has been red-lined - simply omit

Section 9: Commercial [pg 29] - Commercial development was requested by stakeholders near the intersection of Twp Rd 232 and RR284 [aka Calgary gateway].

- only one commercial development area proposed is on Simpson's land

- stakeholders expressed interest in more than one commercial hub within the 1900ac SIASP

- unfair to restrict future commercial development to only the developer's land/interest and not based on existing land use, existing development patterns and existing transportation and access locations

Section 10.1 - Proximity to Railway guidelines - fire prevention & protection must be noted due to risk of fires from passing trains.

Section 11.2 [pg 33] - Interface Areas and Transitions - Intermunicipal Interface

- clarity needed in referring to the Shepard Industrial ASP and not just the 'Shepard area' or the hamlet of Shepard which is two miles west of the SIASP

- clarity needed in referring to the 'Shepard plan area' - correct to Shepard Industrial ASP

Section 13 [pg 41-42] - Parks and Environmentally Sensitive Areas - major reference to Tannas Consulting's Environmental Screening report which did acknowledge the PFRA drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 and its significance to local and regional hydrology and future stormwater management but NO mention is made in the draft SIASP

- same drainage ditch was never acknowledged in the Stormwater Management technical report

- same drainage ditch will influence location of ER for lotic riparian system and connectivity to the Shepard Slough complex west of the SIASP

- local topography is undulating, not rolling; with long slopes that are conducive to a greater off-site drainage, as per Alberta Landform Manual and AGRASID

Map 8 [pg 51] Transportation & Mobility map - existing drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 is not identified, this is a serious omission

- correction needed as existing historical drainage ditch will impact roadway and trail design

Section 17: Utility Services [pg 53] - overview refers to the Shepard area - this must be corrected to

the draft Shepard Industrial ASP area to avoid confusion with the hamlet of Shepard
-interim servicing solutions are not effective long term planning for the draft SIASP
-the feasibility of piping water from Langdon and wastewater back to Langdon [9.5 miles away] rather than the City of Calgary [3 miles away] is seriously questioned here

Section 18: Stormwater [pg 58] - describes the natural flow of surface water from the north and west areas of the SIASP into the Shepard catchment area but fails to acknowledge the historical drainage ditch that acts as the outfall or the major conveyance for the water to naturally flow to the west of the SIASP

-storm ponds are not needed on SW-16-23-28-W04 because of the historical drainage ditch
-a full review and update of the 2011 Shepard Regional Drainage Plan is requested to ensure effective stormwater management & planning in future

Map 11 [pg 61] - Stormwater Management Plan map - location of proposed stormwater management ponds is different than those shown in Map 6

-existing, historical drainage ditch is not shown in map
-no need for a stormwater pond due to the drainage ditch
-drainage boundaries on map 11 are inaccurate
-failure by developer to assess local/regional hydrology and drainage patterns accurately - this needs to be corrected
-the technical study on stormwater management also failed to identify nor acknowledge the existing drainage ditch - the report used outdated run-off coefficients from the 2011 Shepard Regional Drainage Plan that are for current day purposes, inaccurate and needs to be corrected

Map 12 [pg 70] - Local Plan Areas - Plan Area A's stormwater management boundaries need to be kept entirely separate from other local plan areas because of the risk of inundation

-local plan areas do not align with the industrial policies in Section 7

Section 23 [pg 74] Intermunicipal Coordination & Cooperation - as the City of Calgary is currently against this proposed SIASP, the implementation is seriously in question

Appendix B - Public Open house - the note taker did not capture any stakeholder comments about the historical drainage ditch on SW-16-23-28-W04 and the numerous stormwater management concerns

Appendix D - Calgary Metropolitan Region Board maps [pg 249-252 of 372] - all four maps incorrectly identify the area of interest in the map's legend as the 'Shepard ASP'

- this should be corrected to "draft RVC Shepard Industrial ASP"
-the Shepard ASP [2001/2014] is an existing statutory plan.

I repeat that I am AGAINST this proposed bylaw for the above reasons and request that Council does not approve second reading, NOR third/final reading of this draft Shepard Industrial ASP.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter today.

Gary Sutherland
283218 Twp Rd 232

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Al Merlo](#)
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Cc: [Rob Bondi](#); [Merlo, Don](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - SHEPARD ASP / BYLAW C-8172-2021
Date: June 29, 2021 10:08:15 AM

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

Dear Council - We are the owners of DC130 parcels east of 284 Street and north of 114 Avenue.

Our comments on the proposed ASP:

SHEPARD ASP / BYLAW C-8172-2021

General

- In general Draft Storm Report is incomplete with several exhibits blank.
- Interface boundary to the north of our parcels / Sutherland lands is not to agricultural it is to industrial - modify Map 7
- Acknowledge existing federal overland ditch drainage in ASP map 7 and draft storm report (In draft storm report figure 1 and SK-01 and SK-02)
- Include our north parcel in the ASP boundary as all proposed overland out falls in Draft storm report Figure 2 cross that parcel. Additionally that parcel has paid for infrastructure on range road 284 that will be compensatable/recoverable under the ASP.

ASP Edits

- Page 24 section 3.i is inconsistent with maps and should read Flex Lots not Medium Sized Lots
- 18.2.1.e this should be modified such that non curb and gutter conveyance can be employed where appropriate. The current Draft Storm report is too incomplete to determine the conveyance system, and additionally many areas within the ASP boundary have existing approved development plans with different solutions.
- 18.2.2 the word “may” to be replaced with “shall”; again the Draft Storm report is too incomplete not to require alternative solutions to be considered at future planning stages.

Draft Storm Edits

- Figure 1 needs to show existing federal ditch and outfall
- Figures 1 & 2 need legends to be properly interpreted
- Section 7 references a lift station which is not noted anywhere else in the document or supporting figures. A lift station would be a direct contradiction of the purpose of the study which is to identify overland flows to service the area and is in direct conflict with ASP Policy 6.1.6 requiring overland flows. All references to this lift station should be removed.

We are opposed to passing of second reading until ASP is amended to reflect our concerns.

Thank you,

Al Merlo