From: Adrian Prudden

Sent: September 24, 2020 10:49 AM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re: Development Proposal number 20200104 at 52027 Twp Rd 283A

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Re: Development Proposal number 20200104 at 52027 Twp Rd 283A

Dear Mr. Kwan,

I am writing with regard to Development Proposal number 20200104 at 52027 Twp Rd 283A.

If you remember, I wrote to you about a year ago regarding an application that the same applicant made regarding the same property, before that application was withdrawn. At the time you told me there had been a computer error, and that notifications of the application had not been sent out to neighbouring property owners.

I understand from a neighbour that the same applicant has filed another proposal. Again, I have received no official notification.

I am extremely concerned about the impact that such a proposal would have on our local community and I am raising the following objections:

- 1) We already have terrible problems with the road conditions on Twp Rd 283A. There are severe potholes that constantly develop, along with the wash-boarding of the road, on each downpour of rain. I believe these problems will be exacerbated by increased daily traffic on the road as a result of the proposed increased population. The road surface is simply inadequate for increased traffic.
- 2) We enjoy a diverse and populace wildlife in our community. I am deeply concerned that the proposed increased human population would adversely impact the presence of this wildlife, and indeed impact our lifestyle as a result.
- 3) Increasing the number of drilled water wells in the area could lead to an unexpected reduction in volume of basic water supply for existing homes, I have heard reports of such impacts in other communities.
- 4) Although my property does not immediately border on the 52027 Twp Rd property, I understand that the impact on the direct neighbours would be even more devastating. We moved to this area because of its remoteness, low population and natural beauty. I know that the direct neighbours would be heartbroken if this proposed rezoning or subdivision progressed.

Yours sincerely,

Adrian Prudden

50224 Twp Rd 283

Planning Services Department, Rocky View County

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

Application Number: PL 20200104

Division 9

County Contact: Johnson Kwan E-mail: jkwan@rockyview.ca Phone: 403.520.3973

To Rocky View County:

We are opposed to the proposed redesignation of land and any future subdivision. We are adjacent to this neighbors property. We believe he is not a good steward of the land and has shown lack of consideration for his neighbors.

We would like to begin with some technical reasons as to why we are apposed.

1:Water.

Our well is a very low producing well. The subdivision the applicant is proposing will end up housing at least 20 people. (5 per household). Our well barely supports 2 adult and 4 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.

2: Erosion of the land with all the tree removal and the rain run off. The applicants 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 8 vehicles in a small vicinity of each other. There will also be a higher volume of traffic on the roads 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 that the applicant has already placed has not been overseen by Rocky View and they 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.

- 6: Fire hazards without a fire hall in close proximity to accommodate the surge in population.
- 7: Has the applicant submitted a comprehensive concept plan?
- 8: Site drainage. As this area is built on a hill, how will septic systems be handled?
- 9: 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. As there is nothing less than 20 acres to be subdivided in this area the applicants proposition of 4x4 acre lots is far below the allotted minimum 20 acre.

In closing I would like to say that Mr. Trnski 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. As a developer/investor, Mr Trnski did not do his due diligence before buying this land to see that this area is not zoned for such small acreages and that his house is built in the middle of the 40 acres making subdivision of the 40 into 2×20 acres difficult as well as the topography of his property being as steep as it is . Even the 2×20 acre subdivision would be highly disapproved of due to all of the above mentioned concerns. This Valley is a unique ecosystem and can not sustain anymore people,traffic or noise.

I am hopeful the applicant will be held accountable by the County to return the land to its original state if his application is denied. The road ways he has built off the Rocky View Roads on 283 and 283A were built to accommodate access for these 4 x 4 acre lots without approval. Not to mention the excessive tree removal\destruction.

Please feel free to contact me to discuss.

Sincerely

Barbara Smith

From: Brad Diggens

Sent: October 27, 2020 4:19 PM

To: Johnson Kwan; Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Cc: barbara smith

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - 52057 Township Road 283A Subdivison Proposal

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Mr. Kwan and Ms. Kissel,

RE; Proposal Number 20200104

I am writing this to voice my concerns and my opposition to the proposed subdivision noted above. For many reasons;

- 1) The environment Environmentally this area is one of the very few areas in the entire country where as many birds as we have here have been recorded. It is an area where several of the already fragile environmental zones meet, the forested areas are already heavily tasked and are at risk, the water sources are being utilized to capacity, and the wildlife are being placed in constant harm already, adding more people to the area certainly won't help the area maintain what's fast becoming something most seem to ignore without much thought.
- 2] Additional traffic on a road where the MD for the most part ignore and already have a hard time keeping properly fit for drivers, especially at the beginning of the road by Horse Creek Road. Additional traffic will not make this better, it will become much more problematic.
- 3) More septic systems added into this fragile area certainly wouldn't help, it's important to understand that septic systems, no matter how they are designed, place anaerobic bacteria into the ground and is subject to migration into the ground water.
- 4) Noise More people equals more noise. I've mentioned the fragile area out here already, the added noise will most certainly cause issues with the wildlife. They aren't being driven out of the area, they try to live in the area which is their current territory. You can't drive them out, other areas are already taxed to their limits in most cases. Animals are territorial, and placing more people in this environment will only place the animals in harms way, and possibly place the people in harms way. There are bears, cougars, fox, deer, moose, elk, skunks, porcupine, wolf, and many others in this area. We have learned to live with them, understand how to live with them, but to add more acreages and homes in the area will take away the corridors and areas in which these animals live within.

I implore you to carefully consider your actions in this case, it's not always about taxes and money, sometimes decisions need to be made for the good of the nature around us. Without a natural balance, and areas left alone and in as good as condition as possible, we as a society will fail in our responsibilities to the betterment of us all. Taking more natural lands at a time when most in the world is fully aware that environmentally we have to do much much better would be wrong in all ways. I implore you to keep this top of mind. Someone's greedy wants shouldn't determine what is best for the whole of us. This isn't a not in my backyard situation, this is a situation where we need to take a stand against those that want to more or less ruin an already fragile area,

ATTACHMENT 'F': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL

simply to put money in their pockets with no thought or consideration to what they are doing. Why people come to fragile areas like this to do these things is beyond my comprehension, they should buy in areas that have already been stripped of their forests and leave as much forested lands that we still have alone.

Regards, Brad Diggens

50047 Township Road 283

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

2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca
And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned are opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of **SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 hectares (+/- 4.20 ac).**

We are opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is our opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

We have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Area residents are concerned with regards to response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services.

At this time we would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Kerry & Chris BROOKER	
Name:	
Legal Land Description:SE 17-28-5-W5	
or	
Rural Address:	

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point.

2020-10-27

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200140

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my option that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

CLIFF	+ LONA MARTINE
Name:	In In
Legal Land Des	cription:
Rural Address:	280255 RR.54 Rockylhon County, AB
	74C 2W1

Planning Services Department –
Rocky View County 2020-10-24
262075 Rocky View Point.
Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca
And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of **SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML**). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

Tom and Cori Bestwick:
Legal Land Description:_SE 10 28 5 W5 LT 5
Rural Address: _52056 Grand Valley Road, Rocky View County

October 25, 2020

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

RE: Swine Operation

OPPOSED TO SWINE OPERATION

We the undersigned oppose the swine operation 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 at 52057 TWP RD 283A.

Name : Tom and Cori Bestwick	
Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: 52056 Grand Vall	ey Road
Email:	
Phone:	
Cori Bestwick Landowner	_
Tom Bestwick	October 25, 2020
Tom Bestwick Landowner JMLstewick	

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point.

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of **SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML**). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Name: Despina Brotea (president) Cumana Geoconsulting Inc.	
Legal Land Description: Plan 0914481, Bloc 2 Lot1, SE1/4-9-28-5-5 R	ocky View County
or Rural Address:	

From: Ruth Brand <

Sent: September 30, 2020 7:45 PM

To: Johnson Kwan; Division 9, Crystal Kissel;

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Proposal # 20200104

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Re: address 52057 Twp 283A, proposal # 20200104

Regarding any form of extra subdivision in our area, these are our concerns:

We oppose any new housing subdivision

We oppose any commercial operation in our area

Our reasons being the extra traffic for construction and new homes will be detrimental to our ecosystem, which is already at its capacity for human interaction. We are adamantly against this type of development due to the fact that this valley is a rare meeting of all ecosystems and extra traffic would be very difficult for the wildlife and foliage. This area is already over filled already with humans.

Thank you for your time,

Enzo and Tracey Ribaric 50055 Twp Rd 283 Rocky View County, AB T4C 3A1 Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point. Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (\pm /- 3.95 acre) lots with a \pm /- 9.7 hectare (\pm /- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). Note; One of the four is ± 1.70 ha (± 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

Sterling & Gail Motta		
Name:		
Legal Land Description:	SE 18-28-5 W5M	

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point. Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2 2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my option that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- · Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Someth Daw Molow		
Name: Savrett & Rachel Dow		
Legal Land Description:		
or Rural Address: 54188 Strand Valley Rd	THC 1A5	Cochrane, Ac

From: Gloria Anthony

Sent: October 6, 2020 9:28 AM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Proposal 20200104. 52057 Twp 283A

Categories: Yellow Category

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

I have been a resident of this rural area since 1980 and strongly object to the above proposal for subdivision and re designation of land located SE-22-28-05-W5M The Reeve family has held a grazing lease along the back of the 283A for many many years. This land has been the habitat of many wildlife species, which over the years have been slowly decreasing because of increased population in the area. Humans move in, wildlife move out.

Our road conditions will further deteriorate with increased traffic. The 283 is always in a mess.

There will be increased water usage, which could impact the water tables and septics .

Thank you for your time.

Gloria Anthony

50191 Twp 283

Sent from my iPad

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point.

2020-10-27

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca And cc: CKissel@rockvview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009-PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is ± -1.70 ha (± -4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section ac).is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

Legal Land Description: NW +7-28-5U5

Rural Address: 54168 Township Road 282A

Johnson Kwan Lee Rogers From: Sent: September 28, 2020 9:57 AM To: Johnson Kwan Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel [EXTERNAL] - Proposal 20200104 at 52057 Twp 283A Subject: **Categories: Yellow Category** Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known. Lee and Sandy Rogers 283076 Range Road 51 Rockyview County T4C 3A1 Mr.Johnson Kwan Senior Planner Re Proposal 20200104

Dear Mr.Kwan

52057 Twp 283A

My wife and I are sending this letter to you to file our opposition to the above proposal. The fact that the proponent wants to subdivide into 5 acre parcels has always been unacceptable out here,and the resulting additional traffic,road ware and tare. As some of the parcels are on a hill side the erosion would be significant. This area already has major issues when we have significant rain. The added strain on the water table in the area as well as septic concerns. We all out here are very protective of our wildlife as this valley is home to an enormous bird concentration including many rare species.

Thank you Lee And Sandy Rogers

As a side note it looks as though the owner has already started doing approaches and other ground work with no culverts at approaches, this will cause problems with watersheds.

Your File No. 08922009

VIA Email: jkwan@rockyview.ca

October 26, 2020

Attention: Mr. Johnson Kwan, Senior Planner Planning and Development Services Department Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

Dear Mr. Kwan,

RE: Application No. 20200104; Address 52057 Township Road 283A

I am writing regarding the above referenced application. Specifically, the application brought by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of the landowner numbered company, 2110524 Alberta Ltd., proposing to re-designate such portion of the lands located at SE-22-28-05-W05M (the "**Subject Lands**"), from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR), to accommodate future subdivision of four ± 1.60 hectare (± 3.95 acre) lots, with a ± 9.70 hectare (± 23.97 acre) remainder, as described in your letter dated October 6, 2020.

My family owns the 1/4 Section located at NE-15-28-5-W05M (Municipal address 52259 Twp RD 282) and have enjoyed the natural beauty of our quarter and the surrounding area for over 15 years. My family's quarter is to the south of the Subject Lands, along Twp RD 283. We have been in the Horse Creek Road area since the early 1970s.

We are <u>strongly opposed</u> to Application No. 20200104 to re-designate the Subject Lands, in particular the proposed subdivision into multiple parcels less than 4 acres in size. This proposed re-designation is not consistent with the spirit of the valley in which it is situated, nor its surrounding area.

Further, this type of proposed development is not commonplace this far north in Rocky View County, as it is located a mere 4 kms from the border of Mountain View County. These types of developments are seen on the outskirts, or "fringe" of larger urban centres, such as Calgary, Okotoks, Cochrane, Airdrie etc. Township Roads 283 and 283A and the lands abutting those roads are anything but urban areas; in fact, they are miles from any urban area and this is why landowners have chosen to settle here. This proposed application, unequivocally, goes against the spirit of the surrounding lands and the relationship the neighbours of the Subject Lands have to the surrounding lands.

Environmentally Sensitive

Twp RD 283 is very unique in that it has the Dogpound Creek running parallel. In 1989, The Alberta Government's Ministry of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, recognized the Dogpound Creek as an environmentally sensitive creek and entered into an agreement with the then owner of our quarter, to "preserve and protect" the Dogpound Creek in order to maintain the stream as fish habitat. As current landowners, we remain good stewards of our land and continue to work with the Province to protect the Dogpound Creek and its fish habitat by ensuring a fence remains in place to keep livestock out of the Creek.

Extra run-off caused by so many additional parcels being proposed in this application uphill from the Dogpound Creek puts the Creek and the fish habitat at risk. Our family has concerns about the extra-run off affecting Twp RD 283, the Dogpound Creek, potentially our pasture we lease for grazing located to the north of the Dogpound and south of Shadowbrook Farm.

Further, the additional people in the area will only increase the traffic along the banks of the Dogpound, which will interfere with our quiet enjoyment of our land and disturb the cattle and horses that graze over spring, summer and fall, and that live in the pasture over winter. Allowing this type of small acreage development in the area will prevent any chance of protecting a sensitive waterway in the future, as it will only increase the likelihood of seeing similar applications in the years to come. This will in turn result in more human activity and pollution in the area.

We have issues concerning whirling disease in the province and the Dogpound has many species of fish worth protecting, including several trout and mountain whitefish - these fish provide a food source for wildlife.

There is a diverse amount of wildlife in the area: moose, deer, foxes, cougars, bears (black and Grizzly), wolves, bald eagles, owls, blue herons, osprey, hawks, falcons, toads and many species of fish. All of these animals move through the valley along TWP RD 283. I believe this is a unique ecosystem worth preserving, especially in light of the incessant urban sprawl surrounding Calgary/Cochrane.

Surrounding Area

In looking at the Rocky View County Atlas (https://atlas.rockyview.ca/atlas/), the vast majority of the land in the north of Rocky View County (Twp 26, 27 and 28) is comprised of full quarters, primarily working Ranches and Farms. In respect of Twp RD 283, parcels smaller than 10 acres in size are virtually non-existent and those that do exist, seem to have been created as a result of natural geographical subdivision and not as a result of humans (please see the Atlas Map and examine the area).

My family has been an exemplary steward of the land. Our quarter section was a mess when my father purchased it. The logging company that owned our quarter heavily logged it and left massive piles of rotting wood littered all over. My family cleaned it up at our own personal expense and time. Rocky View County did not impose any requirement on the logging company to reclaim the land at any time nor did it or the logging company assist with our clean up costs. That company came, logged, made their money and left a wasteland.

We feel the application for the proposed subdivision of the Subject Lands poses a similar risk the Subject Lands will be sub-divided, resulting in increased human traffic and pollution in the area, and the applicant **numbered company** and the people behind the numbered company, will make their money and leave neighbouring landowners with the ensuing problems. We feel that Rocky View County Council needs to be a better steward of the lands within the municipality and ensure that these sorts of applications (i.e. those that essentially create small urban subdivisions in the middle of working Ranch and Farm communities) undergo more intense scrutiny, rather than simply being rubber stamped as approved.

I have ridden my horse along Twp RD 283 and 283A, up to the Crown Lands, for over 15 years (since my family has owned the quarter). I primarily ride by pristine pastures of green grass and trees - it is a beautiful area. To allow 4 small acreage parcels would forever change the valley and sets a dangerous precedent for the area. Land is arguably cheaper this far north

and allowing this subdivision application to be approved, will only open the flood gates for similar sub-divisions to go into the area in the future.

Crime

Alberta already has a serious problem with rural crime. Allowing a sub-division to go into a remote rural Ranch/Farm area, only invites rural crime and puts the area landowners at increased risk. More houses, means more targets for crimes to be committed and hundreds more people (i.e. contractors, visitors etc. coming in and out of an area they would not otherwise travel to, let alone know about, posing an increased danger to landowners in this remote area. Application No. 20200104 would allow for at least 5 more houses (and upwards of 10 more houses if they put in accessory buildings/dwellings). Please read: https:// www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/alberta/article-wheres-a-cop-when-you-need-one/ (attached). It is worth nothing from the aforementioned Globe and Mail article, "Kelly Sundberg, a professor at Calgary-based Mount Royal University, said there are a few factors that affect the rural crime rate. Large geographic areas combined with communities that have a limited number of officers make things easier for criminal operations. Addiction is also a big factor." The more raw Ranch/Farm land in this large geographic area, with less houses to target, the safer our community will be. Twp RDs 283 and 283A are dead-end roads - this already creates a safety risk for landowners in the community in the face of rural crime. Please keep our remote community safe and reduce the number of potential crime targets by denying approval of this sub-division application.

Traffic

From my experience, Twp RD 283 is not well-maintained - many pot-holes, poor drainage, and icy in the winter (I've nearly gone in the ditch several times just west of the intersection between Twp RD 283 and 283A). Further, there is often flooding from the Dogpound Creek, with the road being impassable for days at a time. It is a dead-end road and increasing traffic is not going to help with the problems current landowners face - if anything, increased traffic will only make problems worse. Excess drainage from the proposed development, will only create more problems for vehicles traveling along Twp RD 283.

Nuisance

It is my understanding that there have been certain incidents that have occurred between the representative of the numbered company and the surrounding neighbours and this is unfortunate. It also speaks to the motive of the numbered company: to make its money and leave; it is not to be good neighbour. This is similar to what the logging company that owned my family's quarter did. Once the representative makes their money and sells off the land, they don't have to face current neighbours ever again. There is no incentive for the numbered company to be reasonable about its application. The numbered company does not have any concerns about our future nor the permanent damage this subdivision will cause to the area.

The proposed application has created a lot of unnecessary stress for neighbouring landowners. It has been brought to my attention that if this application is not approved, the representative of the numbered company has threatened to turn the Subject Lands into a pig farm. While that is their prerogative, I am bringing this to Council's attention because again, and if true, it speaks to the representative's motive. Further, such heightened tensions need not exist and I believe Council should do a better job at alleviating tensions among area landowners and assist with coming up with a reasonable and amicable compromise.

Neighbouring landowners feel helpless, as the numbered company is acting as though the subject application is a fait-accompli: two driveways have already been put in (without proper engineering, as there are no culverts/proper sloping). Those living in these rural communities should not be left to feel that Council is as pro-development as we have seen time and again throughout Rocky View County.

There is a reasonable compromise here and that would be to require a minimum number of acres for a sub-division in this valley (for example: at least 20 acres) and any other surrounding area that is equally as deserving of environmental protection as Twp RDs 283 and 283A.

I am second generation steward of our quarter section and I understand my father's love of our land. If this application is approved, there is no turning back and the damage to the area will be permanent. We need to take better care of our environment - I want my children and their children to enjoy the area in the years to come. I hope Rocky View County Council preserves the beauty of the valley for future generations and opposes Application No. 20200104.

Thank you.

Jenny Kirkpatrick



High rural crime rates and slow emergency response times leave Alberta residents feeling vulnerable

JESSICA NELSON

SPECIAL TO THE GLOBE AND MAIL PUBLISHED JANUARY 24, 2020

PUBLISHED JANUARY 24, 2020

This article was published more than 6 months ago. Some information in it may no longer be current.





Ty Johre pursued trespassing truck over the Lea Park bridge on highway 897 near Heinsburg, Alta., about 230 kilometres east of Edmonton, pictured on Nov. 24, 2019.

THE GLOBE AND MAIL

26/ATTACHMENT 'F': PLIBLIC SLIBMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR THE REMISED PROPOSAL

The trespassing burgundy truck that had been hiding in the driveway suddenly peeled out, nearly colliding with Ty Johre's grey Dodge. Mr. Johre followed the truck as it shot down the range road toward the highway. The pair were hitting speeds of nearly 170 kilometres an hour. At one point, a gun was thrust out of the window of the burgundy truck.

After about 40 km, Mr. Johre gave up on the dangerous chase.

This early-August incident wasn't the first encounter Mr. Johre had with criminals on his family's property near Heinsburg, Alta., about 230 km east of Edmonton. He had been robbed just two nights prior, and later that August he would be robbed again. Altogether, \$19,000 worth of stuff, including a boat and multiple power tools, was stolen from his property that month.

RCMP have reported that property crimes have decreased in Alberta, but the overall rural crime rate remains high. The rural rate in the Prairies is about 36- to 42-per-cent higher than in urban centres according to a 2017 Statistics Canada report.

Many rural residents feel increasingly fearful as a result. They worry they are underserved by the RCMP, saying police response times to calls are too long. It's an issue that is also rife with racial tensions and one that was placed into the national spotlight after Colten Boushie, a 22-year-old Indigenous man, was shot and killed while trespassing on a farm in rural Saskatchewan. Some residents want legislation that grants them the ability to protect themselves, but others want more police officers to help cover the small populations spread out over a sprawl of land.

In an attempt to decrease the crime rate in these areas, the Alberta government has announced an initiative that will add 500 RCMP positions over a period of five years to rural communities.

The initiative is a cost-sharing program in which rural municipalities will begin to pay a portion of front-line policing costs. It's a measure that answers an urgent call from many rural residents, but some remain skeptical about whether it will be enough.

The Johres weren't the only ones in the area targeted last August. The burgundy truck that Mr. Johre pursued had been stolen from a property a short distance away. (RCMP would not verify Mr. Johre's story, saying the case is part of an active investigation.)

On Sept. 16, 2019, at 2:19 a.m., Caroline Parke received a phone call from her sister-in-law. Someone had been banging on the sister-in-law's windows, and she asked if Ms. Parke's husband could come over.

Ms. Parke stayed behind to keep an eye on the couple's four sleeping children. She locked the door behind her husband and stood in her kitchen in front of its big windows.

She watched the red embers of her husband's tail lights move down the road while she chatted with him on the phone. But really, she was on the lookout for something else.

"I'm watching and saying [to him] when I see a vehicle," she said. "Because what they do is pile into a vehicle and they drop people off on foot. Twenty minutes later they circle back around and pick up people."

Rural residents such as Ms. Parke and Mr. Johre feel like they are the perfect targets for crimes because it can take a while for the RCMP to respond to emergency calls.

The RCMP won't give out specific statistics on response times, as they say there are many variables that go into how that information is recorded. In an e-mail, the RCMP said they manage the calls based on whether there is a threat to personal safety, and prioritizing these service calls could affect the response times to other calls that do not pose an immediate physical threat.

Ms. Parke's call with her husband was dropped, right as she caught something out of the corner of her eye. The family dog, who was lying on the deck near her, turned her head toward something. She could see the lights on in one of her husband's other vehicles, with someone sitting in the front seat.

The person ran off and Ms. Parke stepped outside with her flashlight. She shone the light over her property. Seeing no one, she called police to let them know that multiple properties in the area were being targeted.

"I should have gone back into the house and locked the door," she said. But then, she realized a woman was right beside her, holding a knife.

"I was already in shock at this point. It was like she just floated up the stairs and came down with the knife. I just remember that blade. She tried to stab me in the face."

They fought on the porch until Ms. Parke was able to do what she calls "the jersey-over-the-head move." She pulled the woman's shirt over the back of her head and pounded her with the flashlight. The woman eventually surrendered and said, "Take my effing knife. It wasn't supposed to go down this way."

Ms. Parke grabbed the blade and threw it off her deck.

The police arrived soon after and took away the woman, who was eventually convicted in the incident. In all, it was about a 20-minute ordeal.

It's episodes like these that have spurred a concern among so many rural residents that more policing is needed in areas that see few officers covering a vast amount of space. So, on top of the additional RCMP officers, the Alberta government will be training existing peace officers so they can have more power in response to emergency calls. The government also recently passed a law that bans property owners from being sued if trespassers are injured on their property. It also increases fines to individuals found trespassing on a property to a maximum of \$10,000 for a first-time offence.

Bill 27, which passed in November, 2019, followed the case of Edouard Maurice. Mr. Maurice fired a warning shot after he found two trespassers on his property. The bullet struck one of the trespassers, Ryan Watson, in the arm. Mr. Watson filed a lawsuit against Mr. Maurice seeking damages for injuries, post-traumatic stress, and loss of income. The lawsuit was dropped after the new legislation passed.

The province is also seeking changes at the federal level to target rural crime. Alberta Justice Minister Doug Schweitzer sent a letter to his federal counterpart this week, asking that the Criminal Code be amended to impose harsher sentences for rural crimes "in recognition of the victim's enhanced vulnerability." Mr. Schweitzer pressed the issue during a meeting in Victoria on Wednesday with Canada's justice ministers, who agreed to form a working group to study the issue.

But these new initiatives do little to address the root cause of rural crime issues.

Kelly Sundberg, a professor at Calgary-based Mount Royal University, said there are a few factors that affect the rural crime rate. Large geographic areas combined with communities that have a limited number of officers make things easier for criminal operations. Addiction is also a big factor.

"The resources for treating people who are suffering from cognitive, mental disorders, or addiction within smaller communities – rural areas – are significantly less than what are available in large urban centres." Dr. Sundberg said.

"Mental health and addiction have to be addressed provincewide. This is the problem. This is the root cause of crime across our province."

1026/ATTACHMENT 'F': PHPLIC SHEMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR ITHE REVISED PROPOSAL

The Alberta government is taking a similar approach to rural crime as the Saskatchewan government did after the death of Mr. Boushie. James Daschuk, a health studies professor at the University of Regina, said the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations came out with a statement about the no-trespassing laws and expressed how these laws bar people from entering or crossing into land and accessing resources – a freedom that was guaranteed in the treaties.

"It's an amping up of tension." Dr. Daschuk said, "It's a reflection of the tension because, 'Don't come on my land. You're not welcome here.' "

Things haven't become better since the trial in which Gerald Stanley was acquitted in the shooting death of Mr. Boushie. "Really those wounds haven't healed. They're on the back burner right now, but there could easily be some kind of trouble." Dr. Daschuk said.

The sense of a lack of community, isolation and racial tensions add to the "powder keg" of rural divide. "An important social determinant of health is social cohesion," Dr. Daschuk said. "Knowing your neighbour and identifying with your neighbour – that is something that is truly lacking in Saskatchewan."

No one has been charged in the August trespassing incident on Mr. Johre's farm. Now, he has a full-blown security system on his property, but he doesn't think it will actually help. Police wait times are 30 minutes, he said, and that's only if someone is available and in a good location at the time of the call. He will, essentially, now be able to watch people steal from him as he waits for police.

Mr. Johre is skeptical about the new initiative. "It's going in the right direction," he said. "It's not the answer to the problem but at least it's been acknowledged."

The RCMP say they will strategically use the additional funding in the areas of most need, largely rural-based detachments. They could not say if or how many new officers would be deployed in specific locations, but added they will try to fill as many positions as possible.

Ms. Parke also expressed concern about the new initiative.

"Criminals know they have ample time to complete their tasks. If they knew they only had a matter of minutes, many events would not unravel as much as they do," she says. "I hope the extra officers will ensure more presence in the field, but there is no way to tell at this point."

Ms. Parke once scoffed at the idea of being told by officials to hide and "wait like a sitting duck" until police arrived, but her attack has changed her perspective and now they have a new plan should another incident like the one from September occur.

"We're going to go on lock-down mode. That's all we can do. They can take what they want. I would crack the window and throw my keys out if they would leave," she said.

Ms. Parke is still experiencing the effects of trauma; the palms of her hands and fingers go numb and she feels confused and disoriented. But, in spite of everything, she said she is compassionate toward her attacker.

"She's a person. She's a mother," she says. "What kind of a broken person is stabbing someone at 2:30 in the morning, do you know what I mean? They're obviously lost."

We have a weekly Western Canada newsletter written by our B.C. and Alberta bureau chiefs, providing a comprehensive package of the news you need to know about the region and its place in the issues facing Canada. Sign up today.

More From The Globe and Mail

OPINION

As an Indigenous man, I've always known I have to fight or submit. I choose to fight RONALD M. DERRICKSON

Genetic genealogy generates heated debate over privacy while helping to crack cold cases

Parabon NanoLabs Snapshot

RCMP Commissioner must resign, Assembly of First Nations National Chief says

Amplify: COVID-19 has spoiled a lot of things, but I won't let it ruin our Halloween

OPINION

Build communities, not cages: Jails are death traps, no matter how new Justin Piché and Sarah Speight

Thunder Bay Jail. David

Western Canada: It's B.C. election day, but results likely won't be ready for weeks

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

2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca
And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the Grand Valley Landowners' Association is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of **SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).**

We are opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is our opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

We have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for several reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time, we would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Name: J. F. Chmilar, P.Eng.
Chair, Grand Valley Landowners' Association

residence phone 403 932-0729

Legal Land Description: <u>NW 17-28-05-W5M</u> or Rural Address:

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point.

2020-10-27

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca
And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that we the undersigned are opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

We are opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section ac) is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is our opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

We have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time We would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Joanne & Robert W	Villis Villis
Name:	
Legal Land Descrij	otion:NW 1/4 Section 17, Twsp 28, R 5, West 5 th
or Rural Address:	54202 Township Rd 282A Rocky View County

From: Juergen Hanne

Sent: October 20, 2020 6:13 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Application Nr PL 20200104/file Nr 08922009

Categories: Yellow Category

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

I am a close neighbour to the property making this application with my house Nr 53190 just less than 4 Km away. I am completely against it because with these small units of 4 or less acres the nature of this area will be completely destroyed. A. Minimum of 20 acres per new Unit should be a requirement here. There is so much wildlife which will be chased away by these tiny acreages, in specific this area has a lot of different animals as their livelihood.

Sincerely

Juergen

Sent from my iPad

From: Jennifer Stenske

Sent: October 27, 2020 6:43 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel;

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

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Dear, Johnson Kwan

I'm writing this short email in response to the creation of these new residential parcels.

I am opposed, and have serious concerns with the increase load on the environment. Such as water wells, septic systems and wildlife habitat. Also the increase traffic flow it brings to our local roads, causing increased taxes to maintain these roads.

Please reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

Regards, Jennifer & Kirk Stenske

Legal Land Description: SE 17-028-05-5 282066 Range Rd. 54A Rocky View County, AB T4C 2W1

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: Kirk Stenske

Sent: October 27, 2020 9:50 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel

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

Categories: Yellow Category

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

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that I Kirk Stenske, family, and neighbours are opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure, including well water and septic. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing), Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of our community.

Kirk Stenske, Legal Land Description: SE 17-028-05-5 282066 Range Rd. 54A Rocky View County, AB T4C 2W1

ATTACHMENT 'F': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL

Johnson Kwan

From: Lincoln

Sent: September 18, 2020 8:18 AM

To: Johnson Kwan

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - File number 08922009 application 20200104

Categories: Red Category

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

I'm very against this development he is trying to make a small town in the country this will ruin our community. If he was just making two twenty acre parcels maybe this development is not the way to go.

From: Lisa Gillett

Sent: October 2, 2020 5:30 PM

To: Johnson Kwan; Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - File 0892209 application number PL20200104

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Dear Mr. Kwan,

Please be advised that we are opposed to the application for redesignation to accommodate future subdivision File 0892209 Appl. PL20200104 as the proposed use is not compatible with the other existing uses in our neighborhood. The proposal is for an excessive amount of residential parcels in a primarily agricultural/ranching community which will push up population density significantly creating a huge burden on the existing infrastructure.

With the drilling of four new water wells in such close proximity to our well there is the concern that our well could have decreased production. Two of the wells would be drilled within a few hundred metres of our well and could potentially create a huge strain if they draw on the same water source as our well.

Thank you for taking the time to address our concerns.

Sincerely,

Don and Lisa Gillett

Since we do not have the means for electronic signatures the above letter was sent to you by mail with the necessary signatures yesterday.

 From:
 Michelle Mitton

 To:
 Xin Deng

 Cc:
 Lori-Lee Turcotte

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] - BYLAW C-8113-2020

Date: April 15, 2021 4:25:36 PM

Here is a letter for your April 27, 2021 hearing.

MICHELLE MITTON, M.Sc

Legislative Coordinator | Legislative Services

ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

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

Phone: 403-520- 1290 |

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: April 14, 2021 4:06 PM

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

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

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

Bylaw C-8113-2020 - A Bylaw of Rocky View County to Amend Land Use Bylaw C-8000-2020

Application Number: PL20200104 (08922009)

Please be advised that Donald and Lisa Gillett are OPPOSED to the above proposed Bylaw.

Our new Canada Post appointed address is: 52058 Twp Rd 283A, Rocky View County, T4C 3A1

The letter of Notice of Public Hearing was sent to our old address at RR 1 Lcd Main Box 42 Site 2 Cochrane AB T4C 1A1

We are located directly north east of the parcel of land owned by 2110524 Alberta Ltd. and our driveway

directly faces the driveway into the parcel.

As we have already submitted previously, we feel that the proposed use is not compatible with the other existing uses in our neighborhood.

The proposal is for an excessive amount of residential parcels in a primarily agricultural/ranching community, which will push up population density significantly, creating a huge burden on the existing infrastructure and environment.

Our primary concern is that two of the 4 acre parcels would be very close to our own. Our water well is drilled at the far southwest of our property

ATTACHMENT 'F': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL

and the drilling of the water wells for the new parcels within a few hundred metres will cause a massive drain for our water supply. As we only have 6 gallons per minute now, this would be detrimental. We requested a groundwater supply evaluation from Carswell Planning December 2018 at the Information Session but have not been supplied with anything to date.

Since the parcel of land was purchased in March 2018 by a corporation that subsequently hired Carswell Planning to draft a redesignation and subdivision proposal by September of 2018, the intent is obviously financial gain with no concern for the loss of biodiversity or strain on the surrounding ecosystems.

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

Don and Lisa Gillett

Johnson Kwan

From: Scott G

Sent: September 24, 2020 9:37 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - re-designation application

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Hello Johnson,

We received notification of File number: 08922009, Application number: PL20200104.

We are looking at the County Plan (see link below), could you direct us to the guidelines that would be applicable to this application. Is this application supported in the County Plan? Will Planning Services be recommending this application?

 $\underline{https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/BuildingPlanning/Planning/CountyPlan/RVC-County-Plan.pdf} \\ Thank you,$

Lorelee Grattidge

I am writing this letter to voice my concern as a forty year resident in Rocky View County to the proposed expansion via subdivision mentioned in **Proposal Number 20200104** at the address **52057 TWP RD 283A**.

Aside from the increased traffic and vehicular noise that accompanies such an expansion especially during construction, there are ongoing issues of commuter traffic and road wear.

Increasing the density of the population brings increased demands for improvements that the county must provide. The rationale is that the increase in tax revenue will offset the cost for these necessities. In an economy that is very rocky, pardon the pun, it is a promise of false hope since in all likelihood just maintaining the existing infrastructure will prove difficult enough and any influx of cash would be diverted to already present needs.

It is not uncommon for new landowners to offset their initial investment with a subdivision to ally the cost. Our community, by and large is generally very welcoming to new neighbours, especially since some of us have used the same strategy. But I think it is understandable to voice apprehension to such an aggressive expansion. Failing that, the rumoured rezoning of this land parcel to agricultural land in order capitalize via a commercial pig farming operation smacks of retaliatory measures meant to coerce our community into underwriting their investment.

It is my hope that my council members will assess this proposal whose impact on our environmental diversity and rarity as well as our strong community spirit is being jeopardized by a careless expansionist fever.

It is also worth noting that notification of these impending changes is being impacted by the disruption of mail service, with its rerouting of mail to accommodate your changes to our addresses. It's highly doubtful that this is a proper procedure to address these changes properly.

Sincerely

M. F. Johnson 50090 TWP RD 283 Rocky View County T4C 3A1 Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point. Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

2020-10-27

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of these new residential parcels because this quarter section ac) is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- · Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Name:

Legal Land Description: NE/3/28/5/W5

or
Rural Address:

October 6, 2020

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

RE: File number 08922009

Application number PL20200104

My property is adjacent to the subject property on the West side. I wish to express opposition to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- The number one reason for me would be that the proposed 4-acre subdivision would drastically and irrevocably change the entire valley for the worse. I moved from Mountain Ridge Place, also in Rockyview county, to this location precisely because of the peace, serenity and beauty of the mostly bigger properties. I have been riding on the Reeve greasing lease for over 12 years and knew it well prior to moving there in 2018. Opening up to such small acreages would simply destroy the very nature of the valley.
- Secondly, my property, along with Shadowbrook farms, is at the bottom of the valley and collects all water runoff. The dogpound creek runs in my front yard on the West side and the coulee collects all spring runoff and rain runoff from both East and North properties. I had to increase dam heights and culvert size on all three of my dams to try and prevent the extensive damage sudden and/or intense runoffs create. Last year it was to the point my driveway was taken out. On the road side, it is no better. Rockyview had to come in and repair the damage. Furthermore, there is no ditch to speak off past the culvert under my driveway roadside, which results in pooling of water, spring blockages and damage to road every Spring. More runoff would greatly impact this even further. (I have videos and photos of the impact of the July storm last year)
- Third, the extra runoff from removal of trees in the small acreages will increase runoff and sediment runoff. Even if Rockyview makes a ditch (which I asked for several months ago), more and more runoff will find its way into the dogpound, which is where it will be diverted to. Let's face it, more human encroachment does not result in better management, no matter what the developer says. Wetlands are very fragile.
- Wildlife: we are home to black bear, grizzly, cougar, foxes, beaver, wolves, coyotes and numerous bird species. It goes without saying that adding 4-acre parcels all over the valley will greatly impact wildlife. A nice balance exists currently.

In short, while I recognize the financial benefits to subdivision, it is time we all act as we should when it comes to preserving what we as humans have been given. It is a blessing I am grateful for every day and I consider myself the custodian of the property and its wetlands.

I value my neighbours to the East, but strongly oppose and disagree with their proposed subdivision for the reasons stated above.

Sincerely,

Micheline Maes

52120 Township Road 283

Rockyview County, AB

Planning Services Department, Rocky View County

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

Application Number: PL 20200104

Division 9

County Contact: Johnson Kwan

E-mail: jkwan@rockyview.ca

Phone: 403.520.3973

To Rocky View County:

I am opposed to the proposed redesignation and any future subdivision.

One concern is the water in the area. We have a really low water table in the area and barely have enough to support my property. With the neighboring properties in close proximity to this proposed subdivision, 4 more wells will surely be a drain. I am not sure how having that many more people using the water will affect my water flow as well. Also I fish in the Dog Pound creek and do not want to see that habitat disturbed at all.

I am also concerned about these roads that have been put in on 283 and 283A. Both of these roads are not to spec and do not contain any culverts. I do road construction for a living and see that these roads will cause fast erosion of the land and there is a neighbor directly below being affected by it. Is Rocky View aware of these roads?

Traffic and noise is also a concern. This subdivision will create a higher volume of traffic on the roads creating wear and tear. Dust and noise. The Rocky View County already finds this road difficult to maintain.

I also think the 4 x 4 acre parcels are too small. The minimum is 20 acres out here so I am not sure why this applicant has proposed such a small subdivision?

Sincerely

Mike Beach

To: Johnson Kwan October 6, 2020

MD Rockyview Planning Dept

Re: File 08922009

Application Number PL20200104

Dear Sir,

I reside at 52065 Twp RD 283. I am the adjacent landowner on the south side of the subject property and have lived here for 30 years. The property owner is proposing to redesignate the land from A Gen to R RUR and I STRONGLY OBJECT to this designation and especially to the small parcel sizes (4 acres) that are proposed. My reasons are outlined below.

Area Structure

Currently the land in this area is as follows

- The area along Twp 283 and Twp 283A is primarily farm/ranch lands which are actual working ranches. 92% of the land is A Gen or A SML 8% is R RUR (4 parcels)
- Only 2 parcels are 4 acres. Both these parcels are geographically created. One is formed by the corner Twp 283 and the Crown Grazing Lease; the other is on the bottom of a steep hill and is bordered by the stream on one side and the road on the other.
- Environmentally Significant Area. This is the ONLY area in Canada where 4 major life zones meet. Our area has a meeting of the Boreal, Mountain/Foothill, Prairie, and Parkland life zones. Again, is stress THIS IS THE ONLY AREA IN ALL OF CANADA THAT THESE LIFE ZONES MEET! In addition, the Dogpound Creek runs thru this valley creating additional habitat for birds and wildlife. Of the 300 species of birds in Alberta, 163 species have been documented in this valley. Many rare and unusual birds are found in this area. 9 species of owls, Ospray, nesting Eagle, Gyrfalcon, Merlin, Blue Heron and many others have been seen in the valley. Both the Eagles and the Blue Heron have nests here. In addition, we have numerous Cougars, Lynx, Bobcat, Bear, Weasles, Wolfs, Moose, Deer and Coyotes.

This is the nature of our valley, which is on a dead end road. The undeveloped lands and large parcels of trees allow for movement of large mammals and provide homes for the numerous birds. However recent clear cutting of some of the land has put pressure on the wildlife and birds. The bioassay on Dogpound Creek this year showed a significant decrease in fish populations. We are at the very north end of Rockyview. There are many areas that are conducive to subdividing into small parcels where people can live and drive to work in town every day. This valley is absolutely not one of them. A small parcel subdivision is not compatible with the other existing uses in this valley which is primarily working Ranches and Farms. In addition it will put pressure on an environmentally sensitive area, especially if further development of small parcels is allowed.

WATER is another huge issue, especially for myself and Michelene Maes, who lives next to the subject property. Both of us have been impacted by the runoff of the hills down the road and into our fields. Because this road is poorly constructed and has no ditch on the north side the water runs down the road or across the road and has done huge damage to my bale yard and pastures. Last year the runoff caused the road to erode almost 4" deep making driving on it difficult. At the top of my drive the road is not crowned properly and water pools. In the winter the sheet of ice it creates is very dangerous to the school bus and other drivers.

Well depth and water. My well is shallow and has excellent flow and water quality. There are many artesian well/streams in the area. I have at least 2 on my place. Additional development means additional wells being drilled and I am concerned that my well will be impacted.

Road Conditions are another huge concern. The amount of deep pothole and ruts are huge. It is extremely icy in the winter and drivers are often in the ditch as its hard to see the shoulders due to the amount of snow. Flooding by the Dogpound has caused us to be unable to get out on at least 3 occasions.

Evacuation dangers. We have numerous pipelines running in this area. In the event of a wildfire, or pipeline problem that would require quick evacuation this road would be a disaster. Additional residences would only make it worse and endanger more lives.

Future Development. At the present only 2 out of 45 parcels along Twp 283/283A are 4 acres in size. Allowing parcels of this size on one property makes it easier for similar proposals. Again, this road cannot handle more cars on it. It would take significant upgrading and based on what I have seen for the last 30 years- it's not likely to happen.

Sincerely,

Nannette Harrison

Nanotte Hamson

Johnson Kwan

From: Karen Singer

Sent: October 27, 2020 2:00 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel; barbara smith

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - File Number: 08922009 ApplicationNumber: PL20200104

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Dear Johnson,

As a property owners on Township Road 283, we are adamantly opposed to the proposed land redesignation from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) to accommodate future subdivision of four 1.60 hectare (3.95 acre) lots, with a 9.70 hectare (23.97 acre) remainder.

There are several issues of concern. Namely:

- 1. The proposed land redesignation will adversely impact the quiet enjoyment and quality of life our community currently provides.
- 2. The proposed plan will not enhance the community to make it more attractive to those who have currently invested in the area, but at the expense and detriment of the current property owners and residents of the community.
- 3. The increase in population to this area will result in:
- increased traffic
- increase in traffic noise and dust
- increase in road maintenance due to higher volume of traffic -there are several very dangerous corners and hills on Twp 283 and Twp 283A and these roads need to be upgraded prior to considering any development in the area
- is located on a dead end road, causing limited one way access in and out of the community
- increase in crime in the area due to higher population from the higher density of residential housing
- 4. The proposal will have an adverse effect on the water demand. There will be a huge increase on the drawdown of the aquifer that supplies our current agricultural use, livestock use and our domestic use. Water is a precious resource that is shared and is required to sustain life. There needs to be an in depth water management study done prior to any redesignation being considered to prove the communities water will not be affected.
- 5. The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the surrounding neighbors due to the topography. This is a hilly area and the springtime run off and those times of heavy rainfall during summer will severely affect those properties who are downhill of the proposed development because of the change of water flow and run-off. A storm water study should be provided prior to consideration of the redesignation and the future subdivision.

We are asking that this land redesignation and future development application be denied. It is not a good fit nor compatible with the current community.

Kind regards Patrick and Karen Singer 51139 Twp 283

Johnson Kwan

From: Roberta Remmington

Sent: October 27, 2020 3:47 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel;

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Opposition to proposed subdivision

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County

2020-10-27

262075 Rocky View Point.

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca

And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd(Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). Note; One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Furtherimpact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),

Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and

Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

ATTACHMENT 'F': PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FROM THE FIRST CIRCULATION FOR THE REVISED PROPOSAL

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and

rural lifestyle of our community.

Roberta Rei	mmington
Name:	
Legal Land Descrip	tion:
or Rural Address:	282152 Range Road 54A_

Johnson Kwan

From: Robyn Mackay

Sent: October 20, 2020 7:14 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - opposition to rezoning

Categories: Yellow Category

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

Re: proposal number 20200104

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to officially oppose the rezoning and future subdivision in our community. This rezoning will have a direct negative effect on our lives because of increased traffic and noise as a result of the future number of residents accessing the area. The environmental effects will be devastating on the wildlife and the road wear will be much greater resulting in an increase of taxes. The shocking lack of care of the road east of our residence; 53015 Twp Rd 283 after the logging by our neighbour is a clear display of what care the county of Rockyview will do with a further disruption in our valley. Shameful.

We strongly oppose any further major disruption in this valley.

Regards, Robyn MacKay Bruce Roberts

Johnson Kwan

From:
Sent: September 28, 2020 12:27 PM

To: Johnson Kwan

Cc: Division 9, Crystal Kissel

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Opposition to Redesignation Application #PL20200104

Categories: Yellow Category

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

The following is my submission in opposition to the the following:

Application # PL20200104

File #: 08922009

I am the immediately adjacent landowner located at 52005 Township Road 283A. (SE 22 28 5 5)

The subject Application is for a redesignation of the subject property to A-GEN AND R-RUR with a stated purpose for future subdivision of four 4 acre lots with a 24 acre remainder. I am opposed to this application as stated.

I would submit that the addition of four small 4 acre parcels is NOT compatible with the other existing uses in the area, where most parcels in the area are much larger. There are a few smaller residential parcels in the area, but in some instances they exist only to accommodate cut outs from roads, creeks and right of ways. The majority of land parcels in the area are designated A-Gen or larger. The subject parcel of land, and the neighboring parcels are located at the outer edge of the County where small 4 acre parcels are not common. This level of density was not anticipated and is not supported by neighboring landowners.

If one assumes at least 2 vehicles per acreage, the increase in traffic generated by a R-RUR designation and the proposed addition of 4 parcels would increase the vehicular traffic by a factor of five. (from the same parcel of land). Township Road 283 and 283A have been notoriously difficult for the County to maintain even now. Residential subdivision and the increased traffic is NOT compatible with the existing access road.

The ability of the existing area to supply an acceptable level of fresh water to a substantially increased density is unknown. Likewise, the ability of the existing area to support five times the septic capability is also unknown and both of these factors could impact adjacent or nearby property owners. Certainly, there are other areas in the County where increased density has compromised landowners ability to access water.

I also a have general concern with respect to environmental issues and the accommodation of wildlife in the immediate area if the County moves to approving higher density designations and/or subdivisions. This includes such issues as the actual presence of wildlife and water run-off that could result from higher density development. This issue relates not only to additional land development but also to an increase in the number of people, vehicles and noise that would be generated if the present application were to be approved.

Thank you.

Ron Montgomery

Planning Services Department – Rocky View County 262075 Rocky View Point.

2020-10-27

Rocky View County, AB T4A 0X2

via e-mail to jkwan@rockyview.ca
And cc: CKissel@rockyview.ca

And cc:

RE: Application File: 08922009—PL 20200104

This letter is to inform the Rocky View County that the undersigned is opposed to the application by Carswell Planning (Bart Carswell) on behalf of 2110524 Alberta Ltd (Mariyan Trnski-sole director) to redesignate portions of SE 22-28-05-W5M from General Agricultural District (A-GEN) to Small Parcel Agricultural District (A-SML) and Rural Residential District (R-RUR) in order to facilitate a future subdivision of a four +/- 1.60 hectare (+/- 3.95 acre) lots with a +/- 9.7 hectare (+/- 23.97 acre) remainder (as A-SML). Note; One of the four is +/- 1.70 ha (+/- 4.20 ac).

I am opposed to the creation of <u>these new residential parcels</u> because this quarter section is already fragmented with 7 parcels, two through roads and a Creek in the quarter. It is my opinion that this is too much for this environmentally sensitive area. Approval of these future residential parcels could set a dangerous precedent.

I have serious concerns with intrusion of small parcel residential lots in this General Agricultural District area for a number of reasons including the increase in pressure on the environment and marginal infrastructure. A major concern is with regard to the proximity of Dog Pound Creek which is just south of the proposed parcels. Further impact from an increase in non-agricultural parcels and the demands of residential owners include:

- Increased density will further tax the inadequate local roads (poor maintenance, snow plowing),
- Increased load on the environment (water wells, septic systems, wildlife habitat), and
- Residential owners protest response time for emergency services (fire, police, etc.), mail service, garbage pickup and other services expected in city subdivisions.

At this time I would urge the Rocky View Council to reject this application in order to preserve the primarily agricultural nature and rural lifestyle of <u>our community</u>.

Name: Pyan Mackay

Legal Land Description:

or

Rural Address: 53089 Grand Valley Load Lakyview County

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name Hychie 3 Cin	idy Hall
Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: SE al - 2	18-5-W5
Email address_	
Phone:	
Signature	Date 04.27/20

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	ENZO	RIBA	RIC.			
Address	Box 13	SITE 2	RRI	COCHI	PANE	TACIAL
Signature	- Emo	Aire.		Date_	Dec	22-2018

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 Andrew Treich

Address S2001 Tup Rd 283 A

Signature Date Dec 30 2019

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 SCOTT Herociel

Address 50160 Twp 28)

Signature Address Date Dec 30, 16

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 Steve degroya

Address 50008 ND 34 7 HOLSECREEK 2D

Signature Date Doc 30/18

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	Cheryl Lenson		
Address		282199 HORSE CREEK	RD
Signature_	Cheryl Lemon	Date Dec. 30, 2018.	

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 Natu Diggers KATIE DIGGERS

Block 9 NE 13-28-05 West of the 5th.

Address RR VI Cochran, AB

Signature Xatur Diggens

Date Necember 30/2018

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name <u>DER</u>	KICK	HEEREMA		
Mailing Addre	ess:_			
Municipal Add	dress: 282	111 Rg Rd 5	3	
Email address		,		
Phone: _				
	0 1/		4	+ - 6
Signature	V He	er	Date_0	17/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name_Patrick	Y Karen Singer	
Mailing Address:		
Municipal Address: 51139	Twp Rd 283	
Email address		
Phone:		
Signature	1 Date Oct 10/20	

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:					
Municipal Address:_	RR53	2822	226		
mail address)		
Phone:					
ignature	>>		Date	Oct 2	0/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	DWAYNE	WHITNEY
Mailing A	Address:	
Municipa	l Address:	MW-15-028-05-W5
Email add	dress	
Phone: _	A	
Signature		Date 10-007-2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Nailing Address:				
Municipal Address: Plan 67/	-0865	L0+8	Block	NE Sec16
mail address				NF Sec. 16 TWP 78 B 5 W 51
Phone:				
. 2			17	
Signature Down Wan		Date 0	17.77	2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:_				
Municipal Address	50006	Tup RQ 28	3 + House Creek	Rd
mail address		ر		
hone:				

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

ailing Addres	
ailing Addres unicipal Add	282112 00-5
nail address_	
none:	
	4

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name_	Jenny	Kirkpat	ncx for	Clydeh	cink .	Lend Life
Mailing	g Address:					
Munici	pal Address:	5	5225	9 Two	Rd	282
Email a	ddress	1				
Phone:	NF 145	sec15, To	DD 28, R	5 W	SM.	
Signatu	- 1	Veryall	2		tober 10	1,2020

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 Leigh Browdians

Address

Signature Lay Exelect Date Day 30/18

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 TREVOR: KATHLEEN CAREFOET

Address 52014 TOWNSHIP RD 283 A

Signature Date 2018/12/23

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	Stephene	Wiltshire	,	
Address	50006 Tw	1 183		
Signatur	e Stephene u		Date_	Der 22/2018

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	Lyle + Ruth Edge.	
Address	SE28-28-5W5.	
Signature_	RithmEdgl. Date Dec 22, 2018	
	Lyli w Edgo	

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	Vanessa	* Kelly Reeve.
Address 2		1.8.1
50/93	Typ 283	
Signature_	oppelle	Date 1000 15/18

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	THE.	Occile		
Address5	1050	TWP NO	283	÷
Signature	16/	13	Date_ <i>De</i>	c 14/18

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	KEITH LOGAN
Address	57021 Tup. Rd. 283
Signature_	Keith Logan Date Lec 27 2018

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	ADRIAN & PAMELA PRUDDEN
Address _	50224 TWP RD 283
Signature_	Date 30 DEC 2018

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	D Hall			
Address	283094	nr 5		
Signature_	XXXX	el	Date Dec	30/18

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name _	GLURI	7 Ant	hony			-	
Address	50191	Town & 31+1	n Ro	283	Cochagne	Ab	14411
Signatur	e	us And	tone	Date_	Der 30/1	8	

File Number: 08922009 RE: Application PL 20180141

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION

Name	Peter	+ Lorna Li	Siebe		
Address _	53667	283A			
Signature	form	a Webe		Date_	December 30/18

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	monent vi	Mark Colbeck	
Mailing Add	ress:		
Municipal Ad	ddress: <u>283131</u>	TWN 283 RD 51	
Email addres	ss_		
Phone:		*	
Signature	91611	Date Sept 25	120

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Municipal Address: 53105 Township Rd 283	-
Email address	
Phone:	

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name JENNI HEY	Mer
Mailing Address: 50160	TOWNSNIP 283
Municipal Address:	
Email address	
Phone:	
Signature Olm Hu	idier Date Sept 24/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name 15kHU	ATIE	1)1661	EWS
Mailing Address:			
Municipal Address: 50047	Twap. R	1. 283	
Email address			
Phone: _			
Signature		Date	PT. 25/2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

	- 0 - 1 -1			
50150	FOCKYVI	en County	AB	THE 31AT
)		
	50150	50150 Godleyn	50150 Gociegniew County.	50150 Goriegniew County, AB

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	oe Tedford	-
Mailing Address:	SE-23-28-5-West 5	
Municipal Address:_ Email address	30 28 3 00031 3	=
Phone:		-
Signature	& Telford Date September	- 24, 2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name Vane:	*	0	Ræve		
Mailing Address:_	50193	TWP	283	Rocky	
Municipal Address				9	
Email address			0	-	
Phone:	,				-
Signature	20110 6	11.16	<u>U</u> Date_∠	Rept 23/2	D

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address: 50191 Township Ro 283	Rocky VIEW	County	AB
Municipal Address: AS ABOVE		T43 3A1	
Email address_			
Phone:			
Signature of lovin Anthony Date	e 5est 24	2020	

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:	283076	RANGE RO	51	Provide Jam	Country
vialling Address:	203010	TOTALSE TO	3/ /	ACK I VEIU	10000
Municipal Address	<u> </u>				
Email address					
Phone:					
Signature	1 Bans		Date _	5-8124	120

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name Pauro LE	PAGE			-
Mailing Address: 51072 7	WPZO.	283 Cou	My Roc	KYVIEW
Municipal Address: AS ABO	VE			
Email address	,	,		
Phone:				
Signature		Date	EPT 24	2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	Andrew	, Tiei	ch		
Mailing Add	-70	al Tin	01 20	7 λ	
Municipal A Email addre		qur 10	O Fr	7 4	
Phone:	1	· · · · ·			-6
Signature	Afrit	end	Date	Jegt 20	2070

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:	500 90	TWP R	1 283	
Municipal Address:_	Rocky (liew Con	unty AB T	4014
Email address				14C-
Phone:	Ų.			

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name_KEITH LOGAN	
	POCKYVIEW COUN
Municipal Address: Same as above	TUC 3A1
Email address_	190 311 1
Phone:	
Signature Keith Ergan Date Sept	124, 2020.

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:				
Municipal Address:_	50087	TOWNSHIP	Ro	
mail address	,	,		
Phone:				

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

ailing Address:		
unicipal Address: 52014	t Township Road	283A Cochrane,
nail address		
none:		
gnature	Data Sand	- 22/20
ignature	Date Sopt	-33/20_

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name TERRY HARGRADE	
Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: 131-65	
Email address_	
Phone:	
Signature Mag Reso	Date JEPT. 23, 2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: 51080	D two 282
Email address	
Phone:	J

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	isa Gi	llett			-
Mailing Address:		-			
Municipal Address:	52058	TWP	Road	283A	Rockyjeu
Email address	()			1	
Phone:					
Signature	Attit	5	Date	Sept.	19/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	Mum E	dge_			-
Mailing Addr	- A	7			,
Municipal Ad	ldress: 5 6	7281			,
Email addres	s				
Phone:	_				
Signature	Ruth	Edge	Date	Sept	19/2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	coln	Brow	unin	3	
Mailing Address:					
Municipal Address:	5226	O tup	283		
Email address					
Phone: _					
Signature	L.		Date	Set 21	/200

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Municipal Address: 50190 TWP Rd 283	
Email address_	
Phone:	-

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:				
Municipal Address:	5122	0 Twp	283	
mail address				
Phone:)	11 33		

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:	
Aunicipal Address:	51087 Two Rd 283
mail address	
Phone:	J

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

	283085	2251	Parker	1: 6.	+ ,
lailing Address:	103000	15/1 /	rang l	THEW COLL	ny, t
lunicipal Address:					_
mail address					
none:					

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:5	50 224 Twp R	d 283, Rock	y Vices County,	ABTYC3A
	Same as abou			
Email address		<i>A</i>		
Phone:	V	V		

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name _ C	of E	OAM	neer		-
Mailing Address:	Site	50125	RA	TWPS	283
Municipal Address					
Email address					
Phone:					÷
	1 .		S and	77 /20	
Signature			Date Sp	4/10	_

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name Kusta	SORBY 50069	TWP.	283			
Mailing Address:		TWP.	X05			
Municipal Address:						
Email address			- 1			
Phone:						
Signature Lind	16			Date SE	m 21	lan

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name \ \ (\) (3 + 0		RISILI	ic	
Mailing Address:_	50055	TWP.	283		
Municipal Address):				
Email address					
Phone:					
Signature	u fel		Date	Sort 23	2/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

ailing Address:	,	,		
unicipal Address:	53002 7	TWN RD	283A	
nail address				
one:				
		*		

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	40180	u He	auue	-
Mailing Address:	53 19	30 Rac	ise Roce	el 283
Municipal Address			1	
Email address				
Phone:				
Signature	WHA	lluee	Date Sept.	26.2020

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name P. Schnell			
Mailing Address: Municipal Address:	1	52277	Tup Rd 283
Email address	1001001		
Phone:			
Signature P. Schnell		Date_	Supr. 30, 2020

RE: Application PL 20200104



OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name_ Gwynedde A. Mikkelborg	
Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: 5/2/8 cabin.	
Email address	ed -
Phone:	
Signature 5. Muchhelborg Date Sept 20/20	
water is our train issue	

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name <u>Nadio</u> Stall	all done
Mailing Address: 283096 Ang	Rd 51 Rock From County
Municipal Address:	Racky Vall THE 3A1
Email address_	
Phone:	3
Signature Malee	Date 20/26/09

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Mailing Address:			
Municipal Address:	50109 Tup	rd 283	
Email address			
Phone:			
Signature 2 Sich (auth	Date OCT	5/20

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

T

Name KUNALS Me	INTGOMEC	4				
Mailing Address: <u> </u>	LOWNSHIP	Roso	283A	Rangi	1433	ry AB
Municipal Address: <u> </u>	t					79.1
Email addresss	10.					
Phone:	100					
Signature Signature		Date	SERT	24 6	2020	

RE: Application PL 20200104

OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name	raty Dobs	01)				
Mailing Address:_			,			
Municipal Addres	s: # 5227	17 Top	Rd 283	SW 22-	28-05-05	
Email address						
Phone:						
Signature	7 she		Date	020-10-	06	

RE: Application PL 20200104



OPPOSED TO APPLICATION FOR RE-DESIGNATION AND SUBDIVISION

Name_Gwynedde A. Mikkelborg	
Mailing Address:	
Municipal Address: 5/2/8 cabin.	/
Email address	
Phone:	
Signature 5. Muhlelborg Date Sept 27/20	
wader is our train issue	