

3 June 2024

ATTN: Christine Berger, MPlan – Planner 2

RE: 244027 Horizon View Road, 20.00 acres  
R-CRD, SE 25-24-03 W5M  
Lookmanjee, Tahar & Parviz

**Objection to Subdivision to create 8 x 1.82 acre parcels and a 1.82 acre remainder.**

Dear Ms. Berger,

We are writing to object to this subdivision for the same reasons we objected to the conceptual scheme amendment, this application does not comply with the minimum parcel sizes in the land use bylaw. When Truman Development Corporation developed the property to the direct east of this one, we were forced to comply with the 1.98 acre parcel minimums in the R-CRD District. We were given no relaxations, despite our request, and we additionally provided road widening and met these minimums.

This application does not comply with section **326 Minimum Parcel Size** of the R-CRD District which requires 1.98 acre minimums. There is no compelling reason provided to justify the smaller parcel sizes. As we understood it, we were not permitted to go below the minimum 1.98 acres due to the code of practice for private septic treatment systems requiring a 1.98 acre minimum for lots serviced by piped water and NOT piped wastewater. We were required to undertake a level 4 PSTS test and required to keep our lots to 1.98 acres.

The MR strip identified on the site plan is useless and doesn't connect to anything. There is road widening taking to the west, but no linear pathway and we believe if the MR pathway was eliminated the lots could achieve the minimums. We do not support this site plan, with linear MR (*implies maintenance costs to the county with no connections to anywhere else*) as presented.

There is no corner cut dedication to allow for the expansion of the intersection at Springbank Road and Horizon View Road. We provided a corner cut on our road dedication to ensure that the intersection could be upgraded properly at the appropriate time. If no corner cut is provided, the intersection will be forced to be offset should it ever need to expand acceleration/deceleration lanes, turning lanes, or be signalized.

We are suggesting that approval of the 1.82 acre parcels is unduly justified and if approved would cause a negative impact on our existing project as we were not permitted the same consideration. The 1.98 acre minimum needs to be adhered to by all developers.

Sincerely,



ANA Management  
Brenda Thibault

**From:** [Lisa Lewis](#)  
**To:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**Subject:** File # 04725006/application # PL20220041  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 3:33:25 PM

---

Dear Ms Berger,

I am writing to give input into the future development of land that is adjacent to my property. For reference , the application # is PL20220041.

My husband and I, are the owners of 27 Horizon View Court.

As the current proposal to develop the adjacent land into 1.87acre lots for residential development, I am in support of the future development only of the current topographical landscape remains the same.

As you may be aware , the land currently on the NE intersection of Horizon View Road and Springbank Road, is under development into a similar density. This is a Truman development (Trutina Close) which has been in the works for more than 4 years. Prior to development, this was a natural storm water pond which collected waters that naturally flowed down the embankment to the east.

Over the past 4 years, I have watched dump trucks haul “fill” into that development directly from the current Truman projects being developed off of 85th Street in Calgary. Thousands of metric tonnes of fill, including clay, and large boulders, have been dumped into the these newly created lots, and excavated to raise the topography to keep them high enough above the natural water table of the storm ponds.

This creates a twofold problem. First of all, the land (and the artificial fill) under these future homes, will undoubtedly shift over time, potentially causing structural problems within the buildings. Secondly, the now raised topography will alter the natural water run off and force it further downward towards the proposed current application area.


My concern as a neighbouring property, is the current developer may indeed, try to elevate the current topography, just as the other developer did, to protect these future properties from the risk of flooding. This, in turn, could affect the overland water drainage to my property, putting us at risk of flooding/water damage. In addition, water could easily cover the road if the topographical landscape is elevated/altered.

While I understand the proposed development of this property may go forward, I really do want to be a welcoming neighbour. However, I am concerned for my own properties potential risk for future water damage, if the developers are allowed to haul in truckloads of clay and boulders to elevate the current landscape.

This proposal should only be approved if the natural topography of the land will remain the same, and not be elevated to accommodate future water run off from the east side of Horizon View Road.

Thank you for your consideration of my feedback

Kindest Regards,

Lisa and Victor Lewis  
27 Horizon View Court  


~ lisa

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Bo Wasilewski](#)  
**To:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**Subject:** File 04725006  
**Date:** Thursday, May 30, 2024 4:06:25 PM

---

Hi Christine,

Please be advised that I object to Application No PL20220041 for the following reasons:

1. Municipal Reserve should be at a minimum of 10% of 20 acres or 2.0 acres if no cash in lieu is negotiated.
2. Minimum parcel size should be 1.98 acres instead of the proposed 1.82 acres. The 2 acre minimum lot size is the standard for Springbank.
3. Given the allocation of 1.82 acres for the existing property at the NE corner, a MR of 2 acres, 1.52 acres of internal road, results in 14.66 acres available for residential parcels. Therefore a maximum of 7 parcels should be permitted.
4. Any previous council decision permitting a smaller parcel size than 1.98 acres or a reduced MR % without a cash in lieu should be overturned.

Thank you,

*Bo Wasilewski*  
63 Springside St



**From:** [Leah Gibson](#)  
**To:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**Cc:** [Cache Doolaege](#)  
**Subject:** PL20220041 Development Application  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 11, 2024 10:22:49 AM

---

Hello Christine,

We received notice for the application # PL20220041 development in Springbank, located northwest of the intersection of Horizon View Rd and Springbank Rd, to create eight 1.82 acre parcels. As a nearby land and home owner, this is concerning to our family as we view this as setting a precedent for future developments and this property is zoned as R-CRD, country residential, which requires a minimum 1.98 acre lot size and a 10% Municipal Reserve. It appears they are trying to squeeze in an extra lot. There is a 152 acre development across Springbank road from the development in question that could then be increased from 77 lots to 83 lots. With 7 extra possible lots in those 2 developments alone that adds further strain to all 6 concerning below points.

1. ROAD TRAFFIC - We have concerns regarding the additional road traffic this, and other future developments will bring to our already busy roads. We have already experienced a collision and many near misses with drivers not slowing down to allow us to safely turn into our property.
2. WATER & SEPTIC - Impact of water and septic for all the additional homes especially given the drought like conditions we are experiencing in the greater Calgary area.
3. ENVIRONMENT & WILDLIFE - There is a huge wildlife corridor here. With the Springbank dam and other developments, there is less and less space for these animals to go.
4. CALGARY BLANKET REZONING - Since this has been approved, is this not further incentive to keep the rural areas around the city from growing in density as well? This ties into points 2 & 3 above, to keep our wildlife corridors intact, saving on expanding services and building our city up, not out.
5. SETTING PRECEDENCE - We have an area structure plan for a reason, we should be holding our developers to this.
6. NOISE & VISUAL IMPACTS - This will be very disruptive for years once development is approved.

Thank you for the time and attention to this.

Regards,

Concerned Residents

**From:** [Sopher, Mark](#)  
**To:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** PL20220041, File 04725006, Horizon View Road and Springbank Road  
**Date:** Thursday, June 6, 2024 4:03:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Hi Christine,

We are resident owners at 244100 Horizon View Road and are in receipt of your letter dated May 16, 2024.

We are completely in favor of this subdivision application at the end of our street, if approved with properly sized parcels.

We strongly oppose the creation of any lot under 2 acres. These parcels should be redrawn so they meet the proper size minimum requirements set forth by Rocky View. Nearly 10% below the minimum size is far too great an exception and an approval would set a dangerous precedent for sizing future developments. Across the road from this application site is Timberstone Ridge with sizing of 1.98 acres, which should be a bare minimum for Springbank.

Laurel Sopher (owner) is copied as well, please feel free to reach out if you require further comments.

Sincerely,

**Mark Sopher** BA. BComm. CIM

**Portfolio Manager**

BMO Nesbitt Burns™®

---

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal. Unless otherwise stated, opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and are not endorsed by the author's employer. Please be advised we cannot accept trading instructions via Email.

Le présent message, ainsi que tout fichier qui y est joint, est envoyé à l'intention exclusive de son ou de ses destinataires; il est de nature confidentielle et peut constituer une information privilégiée. Nous avertissons toute personne autre que le destinataire prévu que tout examen, réacheminement, impression, copie, distribution ou autre utilisation de ce message et de tout fichier qui y est joint est strictement interdit. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de courriel et supprimer ce message et tout document joint de votre système. Sauf indication contraire, les opinions exprimées dans le présent message sont celles de l'auteur et ne sont pas avalisées par l'employeur de l'auteur. Veuillez prendre note que nous ne pouvons accepter aucune instruction de négociation par courriel.

Ivan Price  
51 Springside Street  
Calgary  
Alberta  
Canada  
T3Z 3M1

2024-05-22

Planning Services Department  
Rocky View County  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County  
Alberta  
T4A 0X2

Re : File Number 04725006  
Application Number PL20220041  
Division 2

I wish to object to the application on the grounds that minimum parcel size is 2 acres according to ASP and past subdivisions.

Land area:	20 acres	=20 acres
Municipal Reserve (10%):	2 acres	=2 acres
Parcel Size:	2.06 acres	
Number of parcels	8	= 16.5 acres

Therefore there can be no “remainder” or the number of parcel can be 7 only.

It is obvious that they are trying to squeeze one extra parcel in. This should not be allowed as it would set a precedent and puts the minimum lot size on a slippery slope toward smaller lots.

Yours Sincerely

Ivan Price



**From:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**To:** [Anna M Stys](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Application number PL20220041, file 04725006  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 5, 2024 3:47:00 PM

Hi Anna and Peter,

Rocky View County circulates each planning application to adjacent neighbors as per Council Policy C-327. If any input is received, it will be sent to the applicant for review and included in the report package for Council to consider when making a decision on an application.

Administration has circulated the proposal as submitted; if there were any changes to the number of parcels, the application would need to be re-circulated. The proposal is currently for 8 new parcels and 1 remainder.

Hope this information helps.

Sincerely,

**CHRISTINE BERGER**, MPLAN  
Planner 2 | Planning

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**  
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2  
Office Phone: 403-520-3904  
[cburger@rockyview.ca](mailto:cburger@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://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:** Anna M Stys  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:05 AM  
**To:** Christine Berger <[CBerger@rockyview.ca](mailto:CBerger@rockyview.ca)>  
**Subject:** Re: Application number PL20220041, file 04725006

Thanks for your quick reply, Ms. Berger.

If this new zoning concept has been approved in other areas, then why ask for public input? Is this just a rubber-stamping procedure that we are engaged in?

As well, on the sign posted on the lot (see below), there appears to be an application for 9, not EIGHT, parcels of land. Looking at the development proposal, one of those parcels seems to be some sort of a community area. IF this proposal does move ahead (and hopefully it will not), will Rockyview guarantee that there will be only EIGHT homes, NOT nine, going into that area?

Anna & Peter Stys  
43 Springside St



On Jun 3, 2024, at 4:30 PM, Christine Berger <[CBerger@rockyview.ca](mailto:CBerger@rockyview.ca)> wrote:



Good afternoon Anna and Peter,

Administration has received your comments regarding Application PL20220041. They will be sent to the applicant for review and included in the subdivision report for Council to consider. There is a previously-approved conceptual scheme in place for these lands if you wish to review: <https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/BuildingPlanning/Planning/CS/Approved/CS-Partridge-View.pdf>. This parcel is identified as Cell "G" in the Partridge View Conceptual Scheme.

Sincerely,

**Christine Berger**, MPlan  
Planner 2 | Planning

**Rocky View County**  
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2  
Office Phone: 403-520-3904  
[cberger@rockyview.ca](mailto:cberger@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://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:** Anna M Stys [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 3, 2024 3:41 PM  
**To:** Christine Berger <[C.Berger@rockyview.ca](mailto:C.Berger@rockyview.ca)>  
**Subject:** Application number PL20220041, file 04725006

Dear Ms Berger,

We would like to file an objection to the proposed application for development of the land intersecting Horizon View Road and Springbank Road in Rockyview (see enclosed)

This property is zoned as R-CRD, country residential, requiring a minimum of 1.98 acres and a 10% municipal reserve. Why now has this requirement for a 1.98 lot been decreased to 1.82 acres? The zoning requirements were established for a reason-to maintain the unique character of Springbank. We see absolutely no reason why the rules should be arbitrarily suspended to accommodate any particular developer.

Our property will be impacted by this development and we strongly object to the developer squeezing in an extra lot by discarding the zone requirements. Doing so will set a precedent for future developers to ignore established zoning rules for country residential properties in Rockyview.

We look forward to hearing your comments on this matter.

Sincerely,

Anna & Peter Stys  
43 Springside Street  
[REDACTED]

<image001.jpg>

**From:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**To:** [Jaskarn Jaswal](#)  
**Cc:** [Mohinder Jaswal](#)  
**Subject:** RE: File No. 04725006 Inquiry  
**Date:** Thursday, May 30, 2024 11:56:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [PL20220041\\_Mapset.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

Good morning Jas,

I have attached the adjacent owner mapset with the tentative plan of subdivision included. I'll also link the Partridge View Conceptual Scheme [here](#), as this parcel is identified as Cell "G" in the approved Conceptual Scheme.

To be clear, the lot labelled "TH16" on this plan is currently a proposed lot located within the parcel subject to this application; it is not currently an individually-owned parcel. I've included another image below that may be helpful.



Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thank you,

**CHRISTINE BERGER**, MPLAN  
Planner 2 | Planning

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**  
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2

Office Phone: 403-520-3904

[cberger@rockyview.ca](mailto:cberger@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://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:** Jaskarn Jaswal [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2024 2:25 PM

**To:** Christine Berger <CBerger@rockyview.ca>

**Cc:** Mohinder Jaswa [REDACTED]

**Subject:** File No. 04725006 Inquiry

Hi Christine,

It is nice to e-meet you! I recently received a notice concerning a land application (File Number: 04725006, Application Number: PL20220041). My lot is located on the map labelled "TH16".

I am writing to inquire about the details of this application as I am unsure of exactly what is happening and how it may affect my property. Could you please provide more information or clarify the purpose and implications of this application? Thank you for your assistance.

Best regards,

Jas





**From:** [M. Hunter](#)  
**To:** [Christine Berger](#)  
**Subject:** Re: RE Development Proposal file # 04725006  
**Date:** Thursday, May 23, 2024 2:18:07 PM

---

Ms. Berger,

Thank you for your very rapid and informative reply.

We have lived within the Westridge “service area” for many years. In fact a line runs adjacent to our east border on Escarpment Drive.

We have heard (not direct from Westridge) that as a result of recent extensions of their device, they are now at full capacity. Perhaps that is a false rumour.

Thank you for your help and I guess we just wait and see how the application proceeds.

Michael Hunter

On May 23, 2024, at 11:35 AM, Christine Berger <[CBerger@rockyview.ca](mailto:CBerger@rockyview.ca)> wrote:

Good morning Mr. Hunter,

The proposed lots are to be serviced through Westridge Utilities; the line currently runs along the east side of the subject site. Connection to the water line would be included as a recommended condition of subdivision.

Although the subdivision application is not available online, the application follows the previously-approved Partridge View Conceptual Scheme which can be found here:

<https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/BuildingPlanning/Planning/CS/Approved/CS-Partridge-View.pdf>. Note this site falls into Development Cell G. The Conceptual Scheme specifies water servicing is to be provided through a distribution system (Policy 6.1.1).

Please let me know if you have any other questions regarding the application.

Thank you,

CHRISTINE BERGER , MPLAN  
Planner 2 | Planning

ROCKY VIEW COUNTY  
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2  
Office Phone: 403-520-3904  
[cberger@rockyview.ca](mailto:cberger@rockyview.ca) | [www.rockyview.ca](http://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.

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

From: M. Hunter [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 10:48 AM  
To: Christine Berger <CBerger@rockyview.ca>  
Subject: RE Development Proposal file # 04725006

Ms. Berger,

We recently received the notice of the noted development proposal. (See attached).

I have concerns re water provision as we are water-well dependant on our property.

I have tried to get more info about the proposal by searching the website using both the file # and the application number but I have had no luck.

How can I access more detailed info about the proposal?

Thanks for your help.

K. Michael Hunter MD FRCSC