

Policy 327 Implementaton Review**Attachment D: Landowner Correspondence**

Karin Hunter
Springbank Community Association
244259 RR33
Calgary, Alberta
T3Z 2E8



Rocky View County: Planning Department
Attention: Dominic Kazmierczak
Re: Circulation and Notification Standards: Change Request
Delivered Via Email to: DKazmierczak@rockyview.ca

September 10, 2021

The current Public Notification Policy, C-327, Circulation and Notification Standards¹, does not provide for adequate notification to communities for planning and development items. The objective of Policy C-327 should be to facilitate sufficient review of, and thoughtful comment on, planning items by affected residents and communities.

The undersigned respectfully request that Rocky View County:

1. Update the Policy C-327 to permit administration to circulate planning items to any Community Association or Chamber of Commerce that requests such circulation for the division(s) in which they operate.
2. Circulate all notices of development (permits, applications, hearings, comment periods, etc) to the undersigned, according to their respective divisions, while Policy C-327 is under review.
3. Post all planning and development applications to the Planning section of the Rocky View County website. Applications should be organized by division. As an example, applications such as PL20210118 (RR31 river access closure in Springbank) are not currently available on the County website until they pass first reading. Communities have a right to know what is upcoming/ proposed in their areas.
4. Update the County website planning section to list all planning documents by division, rather than alphabetically. This includes *MSDPs, Plans Under Review, Approved Conceptual Schemes and Proposed Conceptual Schemes*.
5. Create a map for the Planning homepage that shows planning items across the County, by status, with links to the appropriate documents. This would enable anyone to quickly find out what is happening in their area.

Thank you.

Karin Hunter, President, Springbank Community Association

Chrissy Craig, President, Langdon Community Association

Terry Brooker, President, Elbow Valley Residents Club

Kathleen Burk, President, Bragg Creek & Area Chamber of Commerce

Cc: RVC Reeve Henn, Deputy Reeve Kim McKylor, Councillor Kevin Hanson, Councillor Al Schule, Councillor Mark Kamachi, SCA Board, Kathleen Burk, Terry Brooker, Chrissy Craig

¹ <https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/Government/Policies/Policy-C-327.pdf>

From: Karin Hunter <president@springbankcommunity.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 11:37 AM
To: Matt Boscariol <MBoscariol@rockyview.ca>; Al Schmidt <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]; Rhonda Pusnik <RPusnik@rockyview.ca>; Division 2, Don Kochan <DKochan@rockyview.ca>; Devin LaFleche <DLaFleche@rockyview.ca>; Karin Hunter <president@springbankcommunity.com>
Subject: Re: PetroCanada public engagement

Hi Matt,

As previously provided, I am including a link to the SCA's 2021 letter regarding Policy C-327 requesting improved circulation and notice. For a proposed development like Petro Canada that will impact nearly all residents north of Highway 1 in some way, the current circulation policy is insufficient. As you mention, C-327 is under view / been reviewed. Although you mention comments from "affected stakeholders" are being collected, the SCA has not been contacted on this item despite our clear interest in improving this policy over the past three years. We request that administration review our 2021 letter (supported by Elbow Valley, Landgon, and Bragg Creek) and also consider improved site signage (discussed below). I would encourage you to speak with Al (copied) about the SCAs specific feedback on circulation and notification improvements.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/11Xcwkv9dkc3EWVuZdMIAtZWQHawOMc-c/view?usp=drive_link

Site Signage:

The SCA has spoken with administration several times regarding the inadequacy of signage at sites for proposed land use changes or developments. The current signage requirement is not acceptable in a rural community where people are largely driving by. I would go so far as to say that generally, signage is NOT noticeable at all unless you are looking, and even then, it is too far from the road to read any of the writing. A person would have to pull over on the side of the road or into the nearest turn and walk back, through the ditch to even read the sign. The Airport Authority has some large signs in the community that would be useful as an example. I am sure Zuzana or I can take some photos showing the differences between the Petro-Can signage (RVC requirement) and the Airport Authority if that would help.

A QR code should be added to these signs that opens the RVC link to the application. The City of Calgary can inform some requirements, rather than starting from scratch.

Regards,

Karin

On Thu, Feb 15, 2024 at 3:35 PM Matt Boscarior <MBoscarior@rockyview.ca> wrote:

Good afternoon, Karin and Zuzana;

I was forwarded your correspondence regarding the Petro Canada Application and provide you with the following information to address the questions and concerns.

Prior to an application being submitted, many applicants – especially of larger developments such as the subject proposal – perform their own public engagement and notification. This is not managed or enforced by the County as it is not relative to an active application. Once the application is submitted, the applicant is bound by [Policy C-327](#); this policy does have requirements for public notice signage under sections 13 through 17, and effectively requires the installation of signage to amend a statutory plan, to adopt or amend a local plan, and to amend the Land Use Bylaw with the exception of Agricultural General.

Specific to PL20230127, 128, and 158 for the Petro Canada redesignation, Master Site Development Plan, and ASP amendment applications, the applicant was required to install signage, which was posted for 30 days, coinciding with the agency and landowner circulations. There were two sign posted on the subject property: one facing Township Road 250, and one facing Range Road 33; photos were taken to confirm their placement.

You may already be aware, but regarding policy C-327, On April 11, 2023, Council submitted a Notice of Motion to review and amend this policy, and on April 25, 2023, Council directed Administration to prepare amendments to Policy C-327 to provide a standardized notification area of 1600m (1 mile) for all application types outside of hamlets and 800m (1/2 mile) for all application types within hamlets. Administration then prepared the report and bylaw amendments as directed. On October 17, 2023, Administration presented the analysis to Council and Council approved the amended policy, effectively increasing the circulation area from subject application properties to the properties around them. Administration was also directed to bring a report back to Council with a review of the new policy's implementation by April 30, 2024. Administration is currently collecting any comments received from affected stakeholders on the policy and how it is working, as well as related statistics and numbers to reflect the impact to the organization and the community; we have provided your comments to that file so they can be included for Council's consideration.

The County is working on a number of initiatives to improve communication and information sharing; unfortunately it does take time to get those mechanisms in place. We appreciate your comments and will ensure they are taken into consideration moving forward.

The PetroCanada application is still in very early stages; the circulation period that just recently closed is at the beginning of the evaluation process. The file manager will now work with the applicant to address any requirements submitted by required agencies, and to consider and address concerns raised by landowners during the circulation period. The policy analysis will be completed and the staff report will be written. While the circulation period itself has come to a close, affected parties are welcome to submit comments at any time between now and the public hearing, the date for which has not been determined. Two weeks prior to the public hearing, public notice will again be submitted, will be posted

to the website, and will be circulated via Safe & Sound messaging. All comments received will be included in the staff report and will be presented to Council for their consideration.

We trust this answers your questions regarding the engagement and notification process. Should you have any further questions or comments, please reach out to the file manager, Bernice Leyeza a BLeyeza@rockyview.ca

Sincerely,

MATTHEW BOSCARIOL, MES, MCIP, RPP, CLGM
Executive Director | Community Development Services

From: Karin Hunter <president@springbankcommunity.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 7:19:31 PM
To: Zuzana Ritzer <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Division 2, Don Kochan <DKochan@rockyview.ca>; Karin Hunter <president@springbankcommunity.com>
Subject: Re: PetroCanada public engagement

Hi Zuzana,

We first heard about the PetroCan late last summer I think. They reached out to my VP asking us to distribute information to the community. We expected a site plan (as one was originally shown to us) but in the end just received the "letter" which we distributed in our newsletter. We posted our survey in early October with the provided letter and have discussed in each of our newsletters since then.

We were not "consulted" and we take issue with that liberal use of the term in their application. I would rather say that we were "advised" of the application and consented to share their letter in the interest of providing a heads up to the community. We also have provided all the comments received on our survey to RVC. I would say that the concerns from residents were very consistent. The SCA has expressed time and time again to RVC that better signage needs to exist on these sites where land use changes or developments are proposed (in fact, I reiterated this request just last week, citing the Petro-Canada as an example). RVC's notice protocols are archaic - you must generally be directly adjacent to the proposal to receive a letter. I can say emphatically that we have pushed for changes (with now both the old and new CAO, our councillors and administration) to the notification policy but as of yet RVC hasn't taken up the fight. Don is copied.

Thanks,

Karin

On Sun, Feb 11, 2024 at 12:01 PM Zuzana Ritzer <[zuzana.ritzer@petrocanada.com](#)> wrote:

Hi Karin,

Hope you are well.

I am reading through PetroCanada masterplan and I am very surprised by the “public engagement” section and want to check

With you- did PC reached out to SCA in June 2023 to meet? The first mentioning about PC was in SCA’s November newsletter where you mentioned that SCA doesn’t consider this a proper engagement. They also claim that email

Was provided with the notice (there wasn’t) and that there is a signage on the property (there isn’t).

Thank you for letting me know!

Zuzana

Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: Albert Fialkow <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 8, 2023 11:31 AM
To: Questions <questions@rockyview.ca>
Subject: Waste on Notices

Dear Rockyview County,

I appreciate the need to keep neighbours and land holders advised of developments and public hearings. However, in this day and age it is not necessary to snail mail these notices. I can't imagine the costs to do so. The costs have to be tens, nay hundreds of thousands of dollars on an annual basis. Not to mention, the hours needed to stuff and deliver the notices. There are also the environmental costs. You should, you need to go to an electronic means of communication. Email would be a preferable and perfectly acceptable means of communication. In every case to date, I could not care less about the information you are conveying. This is a terrible use of our tax dollars and resources.

If there are government requirements to do so, amend the laws, change the requirements.

Please make the change.

Respectfully,

1144631 Alberta Ltd - New Horizon Mall

Albert Fialkow

[REDACTED]

Century 21 Bravo

3009 23 St NE

Calgary, Ab.

T2E 7A4

From: Jackie Glen <g[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 4:27 PM
To: Justin Rebello <JRebello@rockyview.ca>
Cc: Matt Boscariol <MBoscariol@rockyview.ca>; Don Kochan <kochandiv2@gmail.com>
Subject: Feedback on Policy C-327 - for the review meeting April 30th, 2024

Justin, Matt and Don:

I have attached a second version of my comments on C-327 - changed from the version sent this morning!

Sorry - not sure how the other earlier version got sent. I just realized this now re-reading what I sent.

Attached is the correct version to use and read. It has the suffix "_ver2".

Again - sorry for the mix-up!

Jackie Glen
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Page 1 of 3

Justin Rebello:

Matt Boscariol indicated I should send you my comments for consideration for the meeting on April 30th on Policy C-327.

I speak for a multitude of residents in Springbank.

The overwhelming majority of residents knew nothing about the ASP (Area Structure Plan) - nor did they know about the upcoming Open House at the end of June 2023. We are talking about for example, commercializing a country residential community - and only a few residents were notified and allowed to give feedback???

A very good representation ended up attending the Open House - considering they knew nothing beforehand except from word of mouth. The residents were extremely vocal about the lack of notification. Rocky View finally sent notification and allowed folks in Idlewild and Country Lane to voice their opinion.

As a result, I believe the Planners had a meeting to discuss how and who gets notified. However - nothing changed.

The 1-mile notification for the Petro-Can at RR 33 and Twp. 250 was sent to only approx. a dozen residents and hundreds of commercial owners, plus those owners can forward to their lessees!! Very few residents, including schools, even knew this massive truck stop was being proposed!

Costco: Costco was conveniently passed right before the last election. Costco has an astronomical impact in every respect to thousands of our country residential area residents and only a handful of residents were notified!

Not only is RV not notifying residents of developments affecting them, they are also restricting feedback to only a few residents!

RV needs to revamp the 1-mile distance criteria for developments and instead closely look at who and how the development will impact.

Criteria suggestions:

- How the development will impact the country residential lifestyle of a community
- How it changes the community dynamics
- How it impacts traffic – number of vehicles added, existing road loads
- It needs an up to date traffic assessment done - one where planners actually have a real impact study and know the numbers - not like in the “Heartland Road” coming out of Harmony onto RR 33 in North Springbank where the road was approved with no vehicle numbers – so how can one assess the impact to the community..??
- How it impacts safety - vehicles, school buses, school and daycare students, bicycles, crime etc.
- How number of acres, number of proposed parcels, parcel size etc. affects the community

Improving notification zones:

- A suggestion for how to improve circulation zones is to use scaled circulation zones, so that the larger the application impacts the community, the larger the circulation zone. “Zone” does not have to be a radius. "Larger" could be determined on a number of criteria (e.g. a redesignation application for one additional parcel could be treated differently from one proposing 20 additional parcels) and consider changes in use relative to predominant uses in the area.
- There needs to be a minimum circulation zone set to ensure real-life circulation zones will not shrink with no recourse – however RV staff need to know this is Policy and decision makers need to know they are mandated to use sound and fair judgement to expand the area when and where appropriate.

The decision on who to contact is made by a decision maker or decision makers:

- The Circulation and Notification Policy (C-327) used by RVC to determine who receives notice by being adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the proposal is guidance. Policy is not statute and staff ought to exhibit independent and strategic decision making when considering who may be affected by considering factors beyond a radius prescribed in policy (i.e., ~246 homes north on RR33 whose only access is RR33).
- “Staff” decision makers on notifications should not be anyone connected to the planning of the development – i.e. when planning to commercialize Springbank with the “Springbank Airport Employment Area, plus “Future Development”– the planners suggesting this should not be involved in making the decision on who to contact as contacting a few is in their favour - for example the fewer contacted the fewer who will comment in opposition to what the Planners/Administration wants and this was very clear in the past. □ Note: The Foundation of Administrative Justice offers a course on decision making where one can learn the blind adoption of policy fetters the discretion of the decision maker.
-

Even consider using community planning groups to assess who and how it will impact - like the Springbank Community Association

It is SO clear the notification zone in Policy C-327 does not work regarding developments affecting residents.

Notifying folks by mail is the best way. We pay taxes and my taxes can certainly include the cost of a stamp! Although it may be costly for RV – it will reach the individuals.

It is all very well to say sign up for RV newsletters - but the reality is, folks do not do this. - it is not a good way to contact folks of impending developments in their area. I have found most folks do not even know about Safe and Sound.

In addition, RVC needs to ensure that all applications are well advertised in all media sources, on a timely basis - newspapers, posted on website, sent out by Safe & Sound (or other RVC email communications), RVC social media platforms and include local community groups. This means that all redesignation applications, subdivision applications, and development permit applications, as well as open houses, county surveys, etc., need to be advertised on all these platforms on a sufficiently timely basis so that people have a meaningful opportunity to respond. Maybe there should be a separate group other than safe and sound for these large developments – or a separate section in Safe and Sound.

It is very hard for individuals to notify folks in their area – i.e. word of mouth, and RV should be doing everything in their power to change the status quo of only notifying only a few residents of developments greatly impacting their life.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jackie Glen

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Albert Fialkow <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 11:52 AM

To: Legislative and Intergovernmental Services <LegislativeServices@rockyview.ca>; Justin Rebello <JRebello@rockyview.ca>

Subject: Government Waste

Dear Councillors of Rockyview County,

I am glad that people are developing in the county. I appreciate that people need to be apprised of developments in their 'backyard'. However, it is a colossal waste of time, effort, energy, postage, paper and MONEY to send landowners snail mail for every application made to the county. There should be, needs to be an option to have notifications sent by email. I imagine that this would save the county 100's of thousands of dollars each year. Really, what does it cost to send out all the notices that very, very few people care about? Please, please, please provide a paperless option. It seems self evident to me that this is necessary. It may help if you educate the public by informing them of how much money it costs on an annual basis to send out these notices. This is a terrible use of our tax dollars.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

At your service, sincerely,

Albert Fialkow
[REDACTED]

Century 21 Bravo

3009 23 St NE

Calgary, Ab.

T2E 7A4

Original Message-----

From: J Tooth <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Friday, April 5, 2024 1:22 PM

To: Justin Rebello <JRebello@rockyview.ca>

Subject: Policy C-327 feedback for April 30th meeting

Dear J. Rebello,

I believe the 1 mile notification zone for residents adjacent to a proposed project is inadequate for projects which will greatly increased traffic. The notification area needs to be extended to all potentially affected parties. For example, the major projects planned between Highway 1 and TWP 250, along RR33, will impact every resident who accesses Highway 1 from RR33, and also RR31 (Old Banff Coach Rd) as the increased traffic on RR 33 will induce more motorists to use RR31. I also believe that the cumulative effect of projects should be taken into consideration and residents notified of such. To be more specific: changes to land use at the airport will add to the increased traffic from Costco and Petro-Can and need to be addressed as a whole and residents notified beyond the 1 mile cutoff.

With the above criteria, basically everybody in North Springbank should be on the notification list for the above projects. As e-mail notification should be adequate, I don't think it is an onerous requirement.

Regards,

J. Tooth
250032 Range Rd 32