Keith Koebisch 271 011 Range Rd 40 Rocky View County, AB T4C 3A2

or

Nov.2, 2023

Dear Ms. Nolan;

I am writing in objection to the application of redesignation by my neighbour Jon Gilchchrist, File 07826004, Application Number PL2023120. As stated, I am his neighbour, bordering the subject lands to the north and east, where I own approximately 120 acres of agriculture land. My land is comprised of approximately 70% cultivated land and the balance being pasture, dugouts and access road (private).

I know the HISTORY of this quarter very well. The first person to fragment the quarter was Stan Reiser that built the home that is on what is to be the new 4 acre lot. He took out 40 acres, which during public hearings was a big issue covered in local newspapers. At that time RVC wanted to preserve agriculture land and they wanted homesteads to be as small as possible. After a big battle Reiser got his way. He then rather quickly sold this parcel to Hermann Bauer and the 120 acres to Victory Five. He told Victory Five this land would be a great spot for a log transfer/storage facility. They found out that RVC would never allow them to obtain industrial designation, so they sold it to me. I have farmed it to support agriculture practices on my nearby home quarter. Mr. Bauer, about 10 years ago, built an axillary residence on the 38 acres and moved into it, because he said the original residence was in very poor repair/condition. In the meantime, he used it as a rental property. Several years ago he approached me to ask if I would give him a "Letter of Support" to divide the 38 acres in half to create two Ag Holdings properties. He said he wanted to dispose of the rental home and said he needed my letter, because he didn't have the required 40 acres needed to make two 20 acre lots. He said once it was divided in half he then wanted to build a home for his daughter on the lot with the axillary house, where he would continue to live. That seems fair and logical to me, but I was being "HOOD WINKED".

What he really did was divide the property such that both the old Reiser home and his axillary home would be on one parcel, leaving other parcel empty for future development. He sold the parcel with the two homes on it to Jon and his wife (the applicants). They had wanted to buy all of the 40 acres (both parcels), but Bauer refused. Then Jon approached me to see if I wanted to sell him a part of my farm, about 7-9 acres next to him. I told him that it might hurt future prospects for my farm, as one day I would like to take about 40 acres out of the 120, to separate the cultivated from pasture lands (when I give up farming).

Jon has been open to me about his plans, but they make no sense. On one hand Jon has always wanted more land, but on the other hand he wants to sell 4 acres. The 4 acres do not fit into our agricultural community. The smallest lots nearby are some 12 acre lots that were created as a result of a divorce settlement back in the 1970's. There is also a small lot which was part of a school quarter. The applicant has told me that even his consultant had told him that this would be an uphill battle, because it didn't fit the community and RVC policy.

Over the years I have been approached by both the applicant and Mr. Bauer to sell them some land, or rights to my private road.

I my opinion, what this amounts to, is that they both want to create a little subdivision of as many residential properties as possible on the 40 acres, which was the first parcel out. It is about bending the system to put on axillary homes, make use of my land, or private access, to somehow spin residential properties. I also know that nobody liked the original home that was built substandard and while it has had many facelifts people don't like it, except for the current renter and I understand he (Adam) wants to buy it.

The major concerns I raise are:

- If the county approves this, it could cause a precedence for 4 acre lots in an overwhelmingly agricultural community.
- The county has no way of "banning" the applicant from trying to get another 4 acre lot.
- I can bet that Mr. Bauer is waiting for this approval so that he can do the same, or something similar, which he has already indicated he would like to do.
- 4. This is not reflective of current county policy.

What is the big deal? How does it hurt me? That property as a whole has been massively overgrazed by many people that have owned or rented it. It has often had way more than the number of horses on it that is allowed by RVC by-law. Noxious weeds are present in great numbers. If I say something they offer to pay me to do some patch work spraying, but I don't really want to, as this is not my business (I did it once for Bauer). I grow high quality grass hay for horses. If I have weeds and garbage in it, it is no longer high quality and would fetch a far lower price. I am unfortunately downwind from this property and I get their garbage and weed seeds blowing in. I have had all sorts of construction garbage and even splash pools, which I almost ran over with my haybine, blow in from their place last year. I rent my pastureland to another neighbour, who has complained to me more than once of garbage blowing in from Jon's. I have no reason not to believe him. It is not from me, as I do not even live there, but I regularly clean alongside the highway.

The Hermann Place road is something that many neighbours don't like. It is confusing to motorists and seems to only be built to facilitate a satellite subdivision.

It was Jon's responsibility to know what he bought and what RVC zoning entails. The agriculture zoning allows for anything from 20 acres to as many as you can afford. You have more discretionary uses than ever before and can even have an extra house for rental income, though that seems like going too far. It is not one's right to grow a crop of residential houses in predominately agriculture areas.

I also wonder about what is to become of the balance of Jon's parcel. Is it Agriculture? Well, it won't be, so what about all the barns and out-buildings. It opens a whole can of worms and another reason I think this would be bad planning.

My Neighbour Mr. Holmes, who also lives very close by, legal land SE 26-27-7-5 NU 21-27-4-5 shares my view that this area should remain agricultural zoned and is not in favour of making an exception to RVC policy. He has asked to co-sign this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Koebisch MAMMI Dennis Holmes W Holmes