File Number: 08922009

RE: Application PL 20000104

### OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name Robyn Maekay Bruce Koberts.	
Address NE 14 Sec 21 Twp 28 W5M.	
Signature Robys Mackay. Date June 1	13)2021

From:

**Sent:** June 14, 2021 8:12 PM

To: Xin Deng

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - File Number: 08922009, Application Number: PL20200104

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

My name is Ronald Montgomery, and I am the adjacent property owner to the immediate east of the subject property. My address is 52005 Township Road 283A, Rocky View County.

The application calls for the creation of an oddly shaped 20 acre parcel that would seem to me to be unusable agricultural land and is not likely to be compatible with other existing uses of land in the area. The application does not provide any indication as to how this parcel of land might be used.

Two previous applications by the same applicant had proposed the creation of 4 residential lots with a 20 acre (more or less) remainder. I am concerned that if the currently proposed subdivision is approved, that the applicant will come forward with a future application to the County to redesignate and subdivide the oddly configured 20 acre parcel into a number of residential lots, perhaps even citing the fact that the newly created parcel herein is not viable agricultural land and that it cannot be readily sold as a 20 acre parcel due to the odd configuration, notwithstanding the fact that the applicant created the parcel in the first place.

The applicant has it made it very clear that his intentions have always been to subdivide this property in order to make money, and has stated that this has always been his intention. I am concerned that this application is not the most straight forward way to redesignate and subdivide a 40 acre parcel, and wish to go on record expressing my opinion that the applicant has an unstated agenda for the proposed oddly created parcel that will require further application(s) to the County in order to achieve the applicants ultimate objective, which is to create small residential acreages.

## ATTACHMENT 'E': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE SECOND CIRCULATION FOR THE BEXISED PROPOSAL E-3 - Attachment E **Page 3 of 20** OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

We the undersigned oppose the land use re-designation and future subdivision of the application listed above located SE-22-28-05-W5M approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) south of Mountain View County, approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) west of Horse Creek Road, on the north side of Township Road 283.

Name BRADE KATIE 1) 166ENS

Address 50047 Two Rd. 283 Rocky View County
Signature Date JUNE 12/2021

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20200104

### OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

We the undersigned oppose the land use re-designation and future subdivision of the application listed above located SE-22-28-05-W5M approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) south of Mountain View County, approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) west of Horse Creek Road, on the north side of Township Road 283.

Name Lincoln Browning

Address 888 Coach Side Cres SW 1341A4

Signature Date June 15/2021

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20200104

## OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name Kunnoth Hanne	
Address 52065 Two Rd 283	
Signature Many Harry Date_	June 15/2021

To: Xin Deng Rocky View County

Re: File 0922009

App number PL20200104

Division 9

June 24, 2021

From: Nannette Harrison 52065 Twp Rd 283 Rocky View County T4C 3A1

To Planning and Development and to County Council

WHEN OH WHEN WILL THIS BE DONE!! MULTIPLE RE-CIRCULATIONS, WITHDRAWN PROPOSALS for 2.5 YEARS!! As an adjacent Landowner I feel absolutely harassed by these submissions and COUNTY COUNCIL NEEDS TO PUT THIS TO REST. I am tired, but not too tired to fight for what is right for the environment, for the community and for myself.

I OBJECT STRONGLY to the proposed redesignation of land from A-GEN to Agricultural, Small Parcel District (A-SMLp8.1) for two 20 acre parcels for the following reasons:

1) As an A-Gen parcel, this property is actually a viable profitable farm operation for our area. The slope of the land on this property is problematic for some farming operations. However, as a sheep/goat operation this property is similar to others in this area that have profitable fleece/ farm market/ goat/dairy operations. If you chop it down smaller, it is still possible as on an ag operation, but much less profitable. The slope of this land is not a real problem for a sheep/goat operation and is likely to improve the grazing on that land. However, I will say that as an operation farm, the landowner will make a farmers living. If you want to split and develop the land and sell it for huge profit....farming operations in any way cannot compete with that.

2) The proposed Land use designation allows WAY too much latitude for development on this land. This is a hugely sloped property, with lots of trees. The trees and undisturbed grasses/shrubs prevent erosion, which is a huge problem to myself and another adjacent land owner AS WELL AS TO THE COUNTY ROAD. Currently, we have an erosion problem on this road and to several properties, mine being one of them. If further tree removal and development take place, the lack of ditches and water runoff create deep channels across the road and wreck my pasture land. Right now we have a barely manageable problem. More development and less trees on this property creates a problem for me and for the MD. Please see my previous submission on video

- from the last time this was proposed as a 4 acre development. It clearly demonstrates the slope of the land.
- 3) The wildlife in this area and this area in particular are part of the ONLY (note: the ONLY) place in Canada where 4 environmental zones come together. Pair that with our stream which is under stress due to whirling disease and sedimentation and we have a precious area which is very rare. Adjacent clear cutting of trees on one section of land has pushed bears, turkeys, eagles, and multiple other species right into this specific area. Of the 300 species of birds in Alberta, 163 species have been documented in this valley. Many are rare and unusual. We have nesting blue herons and eagles in this area. Further development and clearing of trees puts further stress on them and destroys potential homes for all of them.

This has been going on for 2.5 years. All of us have done video submissions and written multiple letters regarding the proposed development and redesignation on this property. I would hope that council would listen to those of us who have lived her for many years and understand why the development on this particular property does not make sense. There are lots of places in the county where buying a property, changing the designation, subdividing and doing further development makes sense. But here, on a dead end dirt road at the far end of the county it does not. Please do not allow the redesignation of the property.

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20200104

### OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	BML	evi	R	
Address	50090	-	TWP Rd 283	Rocky View County
Signature_	Benjar	·	Mil estate	June 17 2021

From: Lisa Gillett

**Sent:** June 23, 2021 5:04 PM

To: Xin Deng

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - File 08922009 Application PL20200104

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

June 23, 2021

Planning Services Department Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

Attention: Xin Deng

RE: File Number 08922009 Application Number PL20200104 Division 9

Dear Sir:

Please be advised that we are opposed to the above mentioned application for redesignation to Agricultural, Small Parcel District to facilitate the creation of a 20 acre new lot with a 20 acre remainder as the proposed use is not compatible with the other existing uses in our immediate neighborhood. The proposal for a small agricultural parcel for a potential livestock operation would be on a larger scale than the current infrastructure can maintain.

As usual my main concern is water. The watering of a large scale operation of livestock will drastically reduce the water available to neighboring homeowners and disposal of animal sewage will be a major problem. The water survey presented in the previous applications for redesignation did not address the drilling of a well for farm animals only residential wells and even that report wasn't sufficient to facilitate the drilling for residential wells.

Thank you for taking the time to address our concerns.

Don and Lisa Gillett

(please can you reply that you have received this email so I know it has been submitted. Thank you!)

From: Michelle Mitton

**Sent:** September 1, 2021 3:20 PM **To:** Xin Deng; Lori-Lee Turcotte

**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8113-2020

### MICHELLE MITTON, M.Sc

Legislative Officer | Legislative Services

### **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**

262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2

Phone: 403-520-1290 | 403-462-0597

MMitton@rockyview.ca | 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: Lisa Gillett

**Sent:** September 1, 2021 2:16 PM

To: Legislative Services Shared < Legislative Services@rockyview.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8113-2020

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

September 1, 2021

Bylaw C-8113-2020 - A Bylaw of Rocky View County to Amend Land Use Bylaw C-8000-2020 Application Number PL20200104 (8922009)

Please be advised that Don and Lisa Gillett of 52058 Twp Rd 283A Rocky View County, AB T4C 3A1 are <a href="OPPOSED">OPPOSED</a> to the proposed bylaw application for redesignation to Agricultural, Small Parcel District as the proposed use is not compatible with the other existing uses in our immediate neighborhood. The proposal for a small agricultural parcel for a potential livestock operation would pose a problem that the current infrastructure could not maintain. Even though there was upgrading to the road a few years ago the hill on the 283A still washes out every winter and spring leaving only one lane for vehicles to drive. More traffic on this road will only make it worse.

As usual our main concern is water. The watering of a large scale operation of livestock will drastically reduce the water available to neighboring homeowners and disposal of animal sewage will cause a major problem whether it's shipped out or not. The water survey presented in the previous applications for redesignation did not address the drilling of a well for farm use only residential wells and even that report wasn't sufficient to facilitate the drilling for residential wells.

The site map for this proposed redesignation has property lines very similar to the previous withdrawn proposals (Dec. 2018, Oct. 2020, Apr. 2021) for four 3.95 acre parcels and a 9.7 acre remainder. It is plain to

# ATTACHMENT 'E': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE SECOND CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL E-3 - Attachment E Page 11 of 20

see that if this redesignation to Agricultural, small parcel district is approved it's just a short matter of time before the next proposal for redesignation to Rural Residential District to break out the two 3.95 acre parcels on the south of the property and at least one on the north side as the access roads have already been built on the north and south of the property.

Since the original 40 acre parcel of land was purchased March 2018 by a corporation (2110524 Alberta Ltd.) that immediately hired Carswell Planning to draft a redesignation proposal by September 2018 the intent is obviously financial gain with no concern for neighbors, the loss of biodiversity or strain on the surrounding ecosystem.

Thank you for the opportunity for us to address our concerns.

Don and Lisa Gillett

# ATTACHMENT 'E': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE SECOND CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL E-3 - Attachment E Page 12 of 20

## **Lori-Lee Turcotte**

From: Sue Browning

**Sent:** August 18, 2021 8:17 PM

To: Xin Deng

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - PL20200104 (08922009)

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

Hi again,

I do not support the proposed subdivision on this application.

Please let me know if you require anything else from me.

Kind regards,

**Sue Browning** 

Sent from my iPad

Planning Services Department

Attn: Xin Deng 262075 Rocky View Point, Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

#### OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

We the undersigned oppose the land use re-designation and future subdivision of the application listed above located SE-22-28-05-W5M approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) south of Mountain View County, approximately 4 km (2.5 miles) west of Horse Creek Road, on the north side of Township Road 283.

Name: J. Craig W. Dobson

Address: 121 Courtenay Terrace, Sherwood Park, AB T8A 5S6

52277 Twp Rd 283, Rocky View County, AB T4C 1A1

Signature: Date: 2021-08-03



File Number: 08922009

RE: Application PL 20200104

### OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name Patricia Schnoll		
Address	J of Road 9411347 114	)
Signature P. Johnst		Date June 11, bosi

Planning Services Department, Rocky View County

262075 Rocky View Point, Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

Application Number: PL 20200104

Division 9

County Contact: Xin Deng Xdeng@rockyview.ca Phone: 403.520.3911

To Rocky View County:

We are **opposed** to the proposed designation of land and any future subdivision. We are adjacent to this neighbor's property. 52103 Twp Rd 283A. We believe he is not a good steward of the land and has shown lack of consideration for his neighbors.

a) I am pleased to see that the applicant has applied for a rezoning of Ag-small to Ag-small, 2x 20 acre parcel split but his conceptual plan makes no sense. The plan splits the land into unusable agricultural space. The Conceptual plan submitted will not work for anyone that wishes to purchase agricultural land. There will be no Agricultural land use as 70% of Mr Trinski's split is on a steep slope. If Mr Trinski feels his split offers the best agricultural use versus the communities suggested spit, then why did he place an access road on 283 (not approved by County) for the 4x4 acre split previously applied for? Obviously Mr Trinski feels there is enough space on the south half of his property to provide 2x4 acre housing, so why would that same space not be appropriate for Agricultural use?

Mr Trinski's proposal would have 2 options for a house to be built:

- 1: A house placed right beside our fence line, 100 yards from our house, accessed from the illegal access road Mr Trinski put in off of road 283A, leaving us with no privacy or quality of life. We moved to the country for privacy and peace especially after a very busy, stressful day as an essential worker in the city and during a pandemic.
- 2: A house on the south side where they can access their property from the illegal approach Mr Trinski put in on 283.

Granted, once owners have bought the land they can put whatever they want where ever they want which is apparent with Mr Trinski's choice of location for his sea cans and tents. So we too are concerned about setbacks and privacy loss just like Mr Trinski. If Mr Trinski feels the majority of his land is useless as was stated in his comments listed below, then perhaps **no reasonable subdivision** can be achieved with this piece of land. As a business owner that purchases properties to make money he should have recognized that at time of purchase.

Here are just a few of the quotes from the threatening email letters sent from Mr Trinski to the adjacent land owners from the last proposal April 27<sup>th</sup> 2021.

- a) I do not hide that I purchase properties with business in mind. I always have plan A and, at least, plan B. No difference with this one. I was lucky to purchase undervalued property.
- b) We have two options, to do subdivision in order to maintain residential character of the land, or to do farming. With the fact that there are only **4 to 5 acres flat land** we can do only extensive raising of animals. To achieve profitability we have to look in confined raising of pigs.

Another option Mr Trinski may consider is selling his house and then keeping the small strip of land beside our property to run his extensive pig operation and continue to pile all his junk up along the fence lines. He has a company called Sip-tech that constructs prefab buildings, he will use this land as storage for his company and will be a complete eye sore for the neighborhood and decrease everyone's property values. Nobody likes to live by a junk yard or pig barn.

### 1:Water

Our well is a very low producing well. The subdivision the applicant is proposing will end up supporting another household (5 more people). Our well barely supports 2 adult and 2 horses on our 20 acre lot. We have 2 cistern tanks to store adequate water. The lower neighbors have an even bigger problem with slow water. A new water report needs to be done as the last one was done by Mr Anderson, the previous owner in 1968.

**2: Erosion of the land** with all the tree removal and the rain run off. The applicant's property is on a steep slope that directly effects his lower neighbors and also the Dog Pound Creek which is a Class B creek. This creek is an important spawning habitat and must not be disturbed. The rare bird species in this valley will also be disturbed due to increased traffic, noise, and habitat destruction.

The property sits on a natural gully. (Municipal act on Environmental Reserves involving coulees, ravines, flood plains, wildlife corridors and significant tree stands). An ecological survey, rare vegetation survey, rare bird survey and wet land survey would need to show no impact

### 3: Traffic and noise.

This subdivision will place a minimum of 2 -3 vehicles on an already bad road creating wear and tear. Dust and noise. The construction traffic of heavy equipment and workers is also a factor. Including road closures and disruption during construction. The Rocky View County has already found this road to be challenging to maintain with the amount of traffic on it now.

**4: Dust** for health of livestock and the wildlife.

### 5: Roadways into subdivision

On August 19<sup>th</sup> 2019 he built 2 access roads off the Rocky View Roads on 283 and 283A. They were built to accommodate access for subdivisions without MD approval. Not to mention the excessive tree removal\destruction. These roads do not follow any road specs and contain no culverts.

These self made roads are not only an eye sore but also a danger to the property below him as he has now created more run off and potential mud slide to that property during heavy rain. A rain fall saturation survey should now be done to make sure the property below the applicant is safe from hazard associated with this lack of consideration to Rocky View County rules or neighbors. At what point will he be held accountable by the County and the roadways put back to its original state?

- **6: Fire hazards** without a fire hall in close proximity to accommodate the surge in population.
- **7: Site drainage.** As this area is built on a hill, how will septic systems be handled?
- **8: Country living.** We in this area moved out to the far northern corner of Rocky View to avoid areas such as BearsPaw or Springbank. We enjoy nature and animals and we are all apposed to the destruction of the land with further development.

**In closing**, I would like to say that Mr. Trinski bought this property with a numbered company in June 2018 in the soul purpose to make money, within a few months he had his subdivision application submitted and his house listed for resale and it has been for sale for the last 2.5 years. As a developer/investor, Mr Trinski did not do his due diligence before buying this land to see that his house is built in the middle of the 40 acres making subdivision of the 40 into 2 x 20 acres difficult yet not impossible. If Mr Trinski cut the property in half with the property line running close to his house east to west he could easily subdivide into 2 very usable Ag-small lots. One north lot and one south lot. The setbacks the county has in place for neighbors seemed to be acceptable for him when he destroyed our line of view for the past 2.5 years so I am sure they will work for him as well. The topography of his property being as steep as it is makes the small side conceptual drawing useless to any new owner. Mr Trinski knew the house sat in the middle of the property and now he is concerned about the 20 acre split line running to close to his house disrupting his privacy? Yet he has had no consideration in regards to privacy with us by having his sea cans, garbage, and 2 ugly tents along our shared fence line and less than 100 yards away from our house. He constantly runs his bobcat at night back and forth beside the fence line making sure to leave his back up horn connected. He has been intentionally disrespectful and disruptive. He has placed a fence line down a partial portion of our road leaving us without any access to our property until we could build a new road, the list goes on and on in regards to what Mr Trinski has put us through and will continue to put us through if the county allows this inappropriate conceptual plan to pass. I recognize some of the inconsiderate things Mr Trinski has done may have nothing to do with a subdivision but it has everything to do with his actual intention of future land use and lack of consideration for his neighbors. We did not invest in Rocky View County by purchasing out in the country to be made to feel like we still live in the city.

Please see the attached map that we feel the community would support. Please feel free to contact me to discuss.

Mr Trinski's argument is that this plan will interfere with his privacy.

Sincerely

Barbara Smith



Bylaw C 8113-2020 Re Designation Hearing September 14, 2021

As a resident of Rocky View County in the area in question **I would like to register my objection** to the re designation of Carswell Plannings subdivision from Agricultural General District to Agricultural Small Parcel.

We, the neighbours on TWP Rd #283, have watched various attempts to re designate this land from the four 4 acre split with 2/3 of the 40 acres remaining. This was viewed as a dangerous precedent for the land parcel size.

Opposition was expressed about the density of the resulting population and its impact on the water table. It would also adversely impact on Rockyview County's infrastructure and road wear due to this extra traffic.

The proposal returned to a 20/20 split. This too was withdrawn in an Eleventh hour intervention for additional revision. The following month the original untenable delineation of the property's was reinstated. The entire western border as well as a very steep gradient along the property's southern edge bordering TWP Rd #283 were the salient features of this subdivision. This produced issues of concern re access and entries.

It is distressing to witness neighbours subjected to actions by the applicant to create disputed access roads. Common sense would dictate that they are in direct violation of soil erosion dynamics, not to mention a common regard for one's neighbours and one's own mutual stewardship of shared borders.

I wish to register my complaint not only to the re designation but also so there will be a record of the laxity in in enforcement of laws in compliance with access regulations. If there is ever a dispute in the future with possible land buyers over these issues that have not been addressed, this letter will provide fodder for legal recourse for any dispute with Rockyview County.

It is not fair to enforce legislation upon land owners while land sellers are allowed to flaunt these regulations while pursuing their profit incentive.

M.F. Johnson 50090 TWP.Rd.#283 Rocky View County, AB Canda T4C - 3A1

From: Erik Bengtsson

Sent: September 1, 2021 6:25 PM

To: Legislative Services Shared

Cc: Xin Deng

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8113-2020

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

Good Day Honourable Council Members,

My name is Erik Bengtsson, and I live at 52014 Township Road 283A in Rocky View County, directly adjacent to the property currently under review.

My wife and I and small child made the decision to move to this particular property for several reasons, not the least of which being the dead-end road with limited residence beyond, resulting in a friendly and quiet country atmosphere where we can raise our daughter without fear of the high volume traffic that comes with small lots and construction.

Our concerns with the proposed re-designation of SE-22-28-05-W05M are as follows:

- 1. Although the lot sizes fall within the current size limit of +/- 20 acres, and this land is designated as A-GEN, the boundaries of the proposed properties make any sort of use inconceivable, and will undoubtedly cause conflict and crowding with the immediate neighbour.
- 2. Increased Traffic is a concern on this road (283A) as the current maintenance program is barely adequate to keep the road passable for the current occupants and traffic volume. This will also increase the noise and safety risk to our children, and other users of the road, which include many blind corners and slippery areas.
- 3. Disturbance to wildlife habitat, as adding more volume to the current lot will unnecessarily constrict local wildlife patterns of travel, increasing their presence on roadways and other undesirable locations.
- 4. Water Usage in this area is already nearing a maximum, as wells producing less than 2 GPM are the norm, and adding another Agricultural lot to the area could render the water supply inadequate for all who currently rely on it.
- 5. The creation of this strip of land so near a rather large grade is certain to cause soil stability and runoff issues, particularly given the access points to these properties, causing large volume traffic in a relatively concentrated area. This will require a high degree of attention to ensure that the slope does not degrade with potentially catastrophic consequences to downslope neighbours.

As a result of the above, both myself and my wife are OPPOSED to Bylaw C-8113-2020 and this change as currently presented, and will continue to oppose any change until satisfied that our concerns have been adequately addressed.

Regards,

Erik Bengtsson & Vanessa Jackson 52014 Township Road 283A Rocky View County, AB T4C 3A1