



## Comments for East Highway 1 Area Structure Plan Circulation File

June 4<sup>th</sup>,2021

### General Comments;

- All references to Town of Chestermere need to be removed and made City of Chestermere.

### Planning and Land Use Comments;

- There is a large amount of communities already scattered in Langdon and Conrich where growth is still increasing, but resources are not meeting the demand. So, what is the motivation behind this application?
- What was the logical argumentation to place Commercial on the Western side close to Chestermere? It will affect our future economic development.
- How the proposed land uses are even uses in RVC's current LUB? Without proposed LUB Amendments how will this go through?
- What is the definition of M1, M2, RR, Ag-M1?
- What is the logic behind the corridor design?
- We need to review the transportation study results because of the high school in Chestermere. I think there might be high speeds and traffic in this area.
- This development will impact the number of vehicles on the main highway, but as well on the rural roads leading in. There would need to be consideration for safety for drivers already using the backroads as many of them are without a divider.
- We would like to know how to get people to and from this district using active transportation. Is the connection going to be provided via the roadway network? it would be ideal to get some connectivity. The connection can be either through highway or along the canal.





- We are also curious about the connectivity to other hamlets, such as Langdon. There are planned transit hubs that is on 797, and to have that extend into Langdon would help with increasing mobility into rural and remote locations.
- The projected number of rural residents that would occupy this area is missing and there would be a need for consideration around amenities and impact on scarce fire and protective services in the service area. This would require additional coordination with these departments.

### **CMRB Related Comments;**

- Based on the CMRB rules and with the newly Board approved Growth & Servicing Plans, the proposed area is not within a designated priority growth area, which will involve further considerations and requirements. What Regional Placetype are you envisioning this ASP to fit within? If an Employment Area, it is important for the developers to be aware of these 2 policies off the get go:

*3.1.3.3 Employment Areas should be directed to Preferred Growth Areas where infrastructure, servicing and transportation is available. In addition, they should be located in areas close to a population centre that can provide opportunities for short commutes and locations where transportation infrastructure can provide for efficient movement of goods.*

*3.1.3.4 Employment Areas may be considered outside of Preferred Growth Areas in circumstances where:*

*(a) the applicant municipality provides rationale as to why the Employment Area cannot be located within a Preferred Growth Area;*

*(b) the location can provide a transportation network suitable for the scale of the proposed development;*

*(c) the development is compact and makes efficient use of land, infrastructure and services;*

*(d) the applicant municipality has demonstrated collaboration with all municipalities within two kilometres, including consideration of cost and benefit sharing between these adjacent municipalities.; and*

*(e) the development has existing or planned services of water, wastewater and/or stormwater servicing with a preference for the potential for full municipal servicing.*

### **Intermunicipal Related Comments;**

- The proximity to Chestermere should be more apparent as it is close to Chestermere Highschool and our planned employment areas within our MDP.
- We believe it will be important for the developers to coordinate and collaborate heavily with Wheatland as there is already an existing ASP and sharing their boundaries.





Here are Engineering comments;

**Transportation**

- The main commercial is on Twp Rd 240 which could be a benefit to Chestermere but it will be interesting to see what the Hwy 791/Twp Rd 240 intersection looks like. It will impact future transportation patterns on the south end of Chestermere and these should be noted on the next TMP update. Twp Rd 240 is a regional corridor but this might change the timelines of when future upgrades are needed.

**Storm**

- It appears that you are going to be draining into the Langdon Ditch which is either CSMI or WID. This area is not part of CSMI so it appears that they will be discharging stormwater to WID? We may not care about the CSMI contribution but it should be noted that this will increase volume that we have been told in the past there is no capacity for. OR are you discharging stormwater to WID?

**Water**

- It looks like you will be tying into the ECRW. Our Engineering team believes there is capacity and we can't think of any issues but we should touch base with Strathmore to see what impacts that this may have on the existing line.

Regards,



**Sara Alinaghi Pour, PhD. Planning, (she/her)**

Municipal Planner, SDAB Clerk  
Community Growth & Infrastructure  
City of Chestermere  
105 Marina Road, Chestermere, AB T1X 1V7

P: 403-207-7075 Ext. 7121

[salinaghi-pour@chestermere.ca](mailto:salinaghi-pour@chestermere.ca).





June 2, 2021

Benazir Valencia  
Senior Planner  
Rocky View County  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

**RE: Wheatland County – Planning & Development Comments Regarding the Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan**

Ms. Valencia

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan. Wheatland County's Planning staff offer the following comments.

- There are a number of residences within Wheatland County in proximity to the plan area, particularly along Range Road 270. Can Rocky View confirm that notification was provided to Wheatland residents in order to allow them the opportunity to provide comments?
- The primary area for potential impact to Wheatland County and its residents is the eastern edge of the plan area.
  - The area is anticipated to allow Agricultural Industrial and Light Manufacturing development. Please ensure that future applications are provided to Wheatland County administration and residents in accordance with the pending IDP.
  - We note that Section 11.2 addresses buffering in the area, thank you for including the interface with Wheatland County as a part of the consideration.
  - Gateways are a consideration within the IDP and the ASP, however Section 12 Gateways does not mention the IDP or consultation with Wheatland County. Please consider amending 12.1.5 to include this.
  - Map 7 Interfaces and Gateways does not indicate the intersection of Highway 1 and Range Road 270 as a gateway. As a highly visible portion of the plan area, consideration of this area in particular merits consideration.
- Transportation
  - Map 10 Transportation & Mobility Concept does not label Range Road 270 as a junction, and it's not exactly clear how these labels apply to policy in the transportation section.
- Note there is a typo on Map 11 Water Infrastructure, "Proposed Warer Main"



- Thank you for the inclusion of Section 23 Intermunicipal Coordination And Cooperation
  - Note the Intermunicipal Development Plan has received second reading from both County's Councils, and is nearing adoption pending CMRB approval. Consider updating introductory text.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to provide comment regarding the proposed Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan. We look forward to your response to the items above, please contact me in order to discuss further

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Stefan Kunz', is located below the word 'Sincerely,'.

Stefan Kunz, Senior Planner  
Planning and Development

*Email: stefan.kunz@wheatlandcounty.ca*  
*Phone: 403-361-2162*



July 13, 2021

Benazir Valencia  
Senior Planner  
Rocky View County  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

**RE: Wheatland County Comments Regarding the Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan – July Amendments**

Ms. Valencia

Thank you for the opportunity to review the amended draft of the Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan. Wheatland County staff have reviewed the redline version of the document available on Rocky View's website, and provide additional comments under the "WC Follow-up" column in the attached table. In summary:

- Thank you for confirming the engagement matters under items 1 and 2.
- We note that our previous suggestions under items 4, 5, and 6 have not been accommodated. Additional clarification has been provided in the table.
- Map 10 features an amendment that indicates that the intersection of Highway 1 and Range Road 270 will be closed. Please see the table for more details, but in general Wheatland County is strongly opposed to the closure of this intersection, and request that this amendment be removed from the draft ASP prior to consideration by Council.

We look forward to your response to the items above, please contact me in order to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Stefan Kunz, Senior Planner  
Planning and Development

*Email: stefan.kunz@wheatlandcounty.ca*  
*Phone: 403-361-2162*

Rocky View County Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan Amendments – July Circulation  
Wheatland County Comment Summary

#	Wheatland County Comment	Rocky View County Response	WC Follow-up
1	There are a number of residences within Wheatland County in proximity to the plan area, particularly along Range Road 270. Can Rocky View confirm that notification was provided to Wheatland residents in order to allow them the opportunity to provide comments?	Residents within a one mile radius of the proposed Plan area were notified of the July 27th, 2021 Public Hearing via mail. The circulation included Wheatland County residents who were within the one mile radius.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for confirming, no concerns.</li> </ul>
2	<p>The primary area for potential impact to Wheatland County and its residents is the eastern edge of the plan area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is anticipated to allow Agricultural Industrial and Light Manufacturing development. Please ensure that future applications are provided to Wheatland County administration and residents in accordance with the pending IDP.</li> </ul>	Future applications will be directed to Administration and Wheatland County residents in accordance with the Rocky View County/Wheatland County Intermunicipal Development Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for confirming, no concerns.</li> </ul>
3	We note that Section 11.2 addresses buffering in the area, thank you for including the interface with Wheatland County as a part of the consideration.	The proponent wanted to ensure development is compatible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No concerns.</li> </ul>
4	Gateways are a consideration within the IDP and the ASP, however Section 12 Gateways does not mention the IDP or	The proponent will draft some policy amendments in consultation with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redline version of IDP does not reflect RVC response comment.</li> <li>• Consider amending s. 12.1.5 as such: "Rocky View County will collaborate with Alberta Transportation and</li> </ul>

Rocky View County Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan Amendments – July Circulation  
Wheatland County Comment Summary

	consultation with Wheatland County. Please consider amending 12.1.5 to include this.	County staff to mention the IDP and/or consultation with Wheatland County.	Wheatland County in creating an attractive gateway along Highway 1.”
5	Map 7 Interfaces and Gateways does not indicate the intersection of Highway 1 and Range Road 270 as a gateway. As a highly visible portion of the plan area, consideration of this area in particular merits consideration.	The proponent will reconsider this junction as a gateway to the plan area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gateway not added on Map 7 in redline version.</li> <li>• Consider adding a gateway on the intersection of Hwy 1 and Range Road 270.</li> </ul>
6	Transportation Map 10 Transportation & Mobility Concept does not label Range Road 270 as a junction, and it’s not exactly clear how these labels apply to policy in the transportation section.	The proponent note this junction on the map and clearly articulate the connection between policy and these junctions noted on Map 10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intersection of Range Road 270 and internal red “connection” road is not included in redline version as a junction.</li> <li>• Redline version now includes a box stating “Access from RGE RD 270 to HWY 1 will be closed in the future.” Note that this was not in the April 12, 2021 version of the ASP.</li> <li>• <b>Wheatland County does not support this amendment.</b></li> <li>• Note that Range Road 270 is under the jurisdiction of Wheatland County.</li> <li>• Range Road 270 is the primary, and currently only, access point for the Origin Business Park. Access to the provincial transportation network is critical for existing businesses, and future developments will be deterred if the intersection with Highway 1 is closed. This will have a significant negative impact on Wheatland County and its ratepayers.</li> <li>• Please provide further information regarding this amendment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why is this intersection proposed to be closed?</li> <li>○ What alternative configuration is being considered (interchange, rerouting, etc.)?</li> <li>○ Why was this not included in the original ASP?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Rocky View County Highway 1 East Area Structure Plan Amendments – July Circulation  
Wheatland County Comment Summary

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the deadlines provided by Rocky View, there does not appear to be sufficient time to review an amendment of this magnitude. Regardless, please provide the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Traffic Impact Assessment.</li> <li>○ Alberta Transportation’s comments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	Note there is a typo on Map 11 Water Infrastructure on Map 11 Water Infrastructure, “Proposed Warer Main”	Fixed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No concerns.</li> </ul>



Construction and Maintenance, Transportation  
Southern Region, Calgary District  
803 Manning Road NE  
Calgary, Alberta T2E 7M8

AT Reference No.: RSDP035999  
AT File Number: East Highway 1 ASP  
Municipality File Number: PLANNING DOCUMENT - East Highway 1 ASP

July 9, 2021

Rocky View County  
262075 Rocky View Point  
Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2  
Email: bvalencia@rockyview.ca

Attention Rocky View County

**Subject: Referral for the items identified below within Rocky View County (“Municipality”)**

Regarding application for the following municipal approvals: Draft ASP referral

Reference / File Number	Description	Location
RSDP035999-1	PLANNING DOCUMENT - East Highway 1 ASP -Traffic Impact Assessment -Stormwater Management Study	Highway 1, 9, 791, and 797 SE-14-26-29-4

Alberta Transportation has reviewed the draft Area Structure Plan (ASP), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and Stormwater Management Report, (SMR) and provides the following comments.

#### Highway 791 Access

- No reference made to Alberta Transportation’s (AT) Highway 791 Functional Planning Study, which realigns Highway 791, defines the interchange limits and plans for twinning. Interchange construction within 10 to 20 yrs., ultimately subject to provincial priority and funding availability.  
[http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/projects/assets/Area\\_7\\_Calgary\\_Area/Hwy\\_791\\_at\\_1/RPT\\_075\\_08\\_Final\\_Executiv\\_%20Summary.pdf](http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/projects/assets/Area_7_Calgary_Area/Hwy_791_at_1/RPT_075_08_Final_Executiv_%20Summary.pdf)
- AT does not support the large rotary junction, as a long term plan for connection to Hwy 791. Big footprint requires lots of land (800m radius), significant increase in highway maintenance responsibilities, could be problematic particularly in winter and/or higher speeds. Indicates the circle could be developed, however this would likely require more access points, adding more safety concerns.
- Interim short term, stop controlled, Type II, III, IV intersection could be considered, a traditional roundabout should be analysed for long term, in lieu of the large rotary junction. Improvements to be determined later, based on development staging and phasing.

### Highway 797 Access

- TIA should analyse the existing interchange at Hwy 797.
- Proximity of existing service road intersection on Hwy 797 to the interchange is problematic. The ASP/TIA should include a plan towards a solution. Not addressed in the ASP.
- AT does not support the large rotary junction as a long term plan for connection to Hwy 797. Big footprint requires lots of land, significant increase in highway maintenance responsibilities, could be problematic particularly in winter and/or higher speeds. Development within the rotary junction would likely require more access points, adding more safety concerns.
- Interim short term intersection improvements could consider stop controlled, Type II, III, IV, a traditional roundabout or signals should be analysed for long term, in lieu of the large rotatory junction. Upgrades to be determined later, based on development staging and phasing.

### Highway 1 / Local Road Access

- No reference made to the Highway 1:10 and 1:12 Access Management Study (attached) which highlights intersection closures, the parallel service roads can be replaced by an internal roadway as shown in the plan. This study should be incorporated into the ASP/TIA.
- The plan indicates closure of RR 275, RR 274 and RR 270. The ASP/TIA should indicate these closures, for each development zone, as policies in the ASP.
- These intersections must not be used for access to new development in the plan area; whether severed at the highway or severed at the plan boundary; will require further discussion.
- With existing and further development in Wheatland County, added development traffic from the plan area to Range Road 270 could quickly become problematic; a connection to Hwy 797 will alleviate this emerging safety concern.

### Funding

- Suggest off site levy collection, for future highway improvements.

### Stormwater Management Report

- As indicated, the study does not provide a detailed stormwater servicing plan for the ASP area, as it is not at the detailed stage in the planning process, rather this study provides a high level overview and analysis of existing low lying areas, pre-development stormwater flow rates, pre-development catchment areas, the location and size of anticipated stormwater retention ponds and stormwater infrastructure.
- As part of the subsequent planning process, more detailed stormwater management analysis and reports will be submitted in accordance with the County planning application requirements, as market forces and development phasing details are determined.
- The future more detailed stormwater analysis and reports will require review from the department, more comments provided at that time.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned Development and Planning Technologist.

Signed:

---

Gerry Benoit  
Dev and Planning Technologist  
[gerry.benoit@gov.ab.ca](mailto:gerry.benoit@gov.ab.ca)  
(403) 297-5027

cc: Jerry Lau  
Trevor Richelhof

---

**From:** Geoff Smith <Geoff.Smith@gov.ab.ca>  
**Sent:** July 19, 2021 1:21 PM  
**To:** Benazir Valencia <BValencia@rockyview.ca>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - FW: Circulation - Draft East Highway 1 Area Structure Plan - Due Friday, June 4, 2021

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

Please accept the following comments, on behalf of Alberta Environment and Parks, Lands Delivery South.

A review of this application area indicates the presence of naturally occurring water bodies. These waterbodies located within the identified area may be crown claimed, as per section 3 of the *Public Lands Act*.

Contact with the Water Boundaries unit in Edmonton is to be made to ensure that these potentially Public Lands, in the form of waterbodies, are identified and delineated within this application.

Should these water bodies be found to be crown owned, application for occupation and adherence with the Provincial wetland policy would be required.

<https://www.alberta.ca/water-boundaries.aspx>

Other notes and comments of importance from the planning document include.

Section 3.1. Maximize environmental sensitivities, We like the statement regarding conserving all wetlands, and take this is as redundant under the Provincial wetland policy. the word "major" wetlands is complicating and limiting, as all wetlands that are crown owned are to be conserved and/ or follow the provincial wetland policy.

Page 34. Technical review. AEP looks forward to reviewing the watercourse and waterbodies identified in the upcoming biophysical inventory, We would add here that wetlands, regardless of size may be crown claimed, the technical review indicates that waterbodies 1 ha. Or larger are to be inventoried, we would suggest that all waterbodies be inventoried.

Section 13.1.2 (C) mentioned government lands, we would request more detail ( locations) into which government lands this is referring, and which Government ministries these lands belong.

Section 18.1.7. Natural wetlands are mentioned as a source for direct and indirect storm water collection. As this falls under the Water act we would suggest the input form that division, as of this time, storm water is not to be directed into natural occurring waterbodies.

Section 24.5 We agree with the statement made in the third bullet regarding setbacks from waterbodies.

Link to wetland policy below.

<https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/5250f98b-2e1e-43e7-947f-62c14747e3b3/resource/43677a60-3503-4509-acfd-6918e8b8ec0a/download/6249018-2013-alberta-wetland-policy-2013-09.pdf>

Geoff Smith RPFT  
Land Management Specialist  
Alberta Environment and Parks  
Lands Division  
Lands Delivery and Coordination (South)  
Integrated Lands Delivery South  
Calgary, Bearspaw.  
(403) 297-8591