

From: [Evan Neilsen](#)
To: [Andrea Bryden](#)
Subject: FW: Mr. Evan Neilsen : I would like to protest file no. PL20190179. The County has a policy of protecting good farm land. This land is good farmland. The surrounding infrastructure
Date: February 10, 2020 1:31:24 PM

For your file.

Cheers,

EVAN NEILSEN
Development Assistant | Planning Services

ROCKY VIEW COUNTY
262075 Rocky View Point | Rocky View County | AB | T4A 0X2
Phone: 403-520-8158
ENeilsen@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.

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

From: Chris Bishop [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 1:29 PM
To: Evan Neilsen <ENeilsen@rockyview.ca>
Subject: Mr. Evan Neilsen : I would like to protest file no. PL20190179. The County has a policy of protecting good farm land. This land is good farmland. The surrounding infrastructure

Is not in place to support any more developement. Glenmore Trail is already dam busy and any more traffic would be horrific. The way the provincial govt. is going , they will not be making a 4 lane road to handle the increase in traffic. Yours truly Gordon Bishop.

From: [MeghenandRyan McKenzie](#)
To: [Andrea Bryden](#)
Subject: Re: Public Notice - Division 4 - SE 21-23-27 W4M - Redesignation from AH to B-I
Date: January 21, 2020 9:11:21 PM

Hi Andrea,

We would like to submit an official objection to application number PL20190179 for the re designation of a portion of SE 21-23-27 W4M from Ranch and Farm to Business Industrial Campus District for the following reasons:

- Uncertainty to the application
 - the applicant has not provided any information on the type of uses that would be applied to the parcel.
 - size - there has been no confirmation of size of the subdivision(s)
- Lack of Public consultation
 - to our knowledge, there has been no public consultation to date for the potential development of these lands. A proposed re designation of this size should warrant a public consultation, as well as details outlining the proposed development, proposed uses, servicing strategies etc.
- Adjacent land uses
 - the proposed re designation is not compatible with the adjacent and surrounding land uses. The hamlet boundary, which is residential, is immediately to the east. Ranch and farm land surround the parcel to the north, south and west.
 - This parcel is also very good farm land with very minimal wetlands in comparison to surrounding land.
- Engineering & Transportation Concerns
 - How is the parcel(s) to be serviced? Is there capacity for water and wastewater? How will storm water be managed? These type of issues should be addressed via public consultation.
 - How is the proposed business area to be accessed? How will transportation along Glenmore Trail be affected? To propose a development of this size should require a formal Traffic Impact Assessment be submitted, reviewed and approved by the county prior to the land use being changed.
- Planning
 - The applicant is trying to bypass the proper planning approvals in order to develop the land, with providing no clarity of if or what will be developed. There has been no proposal for an ASP boundary adjustment, which should be the first step in submitting an application of this nature. Nor has the applicant submitted a proper neighborhood plan for adoption from council to support a land use

change. Trying to skip directly to a land use re designation is not acceptable. Additionally, and please correct me if I am wrong, but council previously has made a motion to review applications such as this one for approval even though they are outside of an approved ASP. This motion was not carried forward by council, which should in turn support a refusal of this application.

- The proper process for planning approvals needs to be consistent and followed by all applications. There was extensive public consultation and engagement when the ASP boundaries were expanded. This applicant should be required to complete the same due process as the other affected parties did in order to expand the ASP area.
- The land is not within the revised ASP for the hamlet and therefore should not be considered for development. The land was not included in the revised ASP boundary of Langdon when council amended the boundary as recently as May 2016.
- There are hundreds of acres yet to be developed within the revised ASP boundary of Langdon - 2/3's of the approved areas have yet to start any development, over 3 years after the approved ASP. These lands affecting this application are noted as a "future expansion area" and there is a minimum 20 years of land supply within the current ASP. The current ASP area should be built out prior to the boundary being adjusted again to allow for proper planning to occur and to see when the time comes of what the area demands are - whether is be more residential, commercial or industrial. The adopted ASP from council states that "the area identified as future study area are lands that can be considered for the future expansion of the hamlet of Langdon once the Langdon Plan area **approaches build-out**, suitable transportation and servicing infrastructure is in place. In the interim, existing uses will be allowed to remain, and limited development for agricultural purposes including farmsteads and first parcels out will be permitted in the future study area". There ASP also identifies issues to be addressed prior to expanding the boundary. The application has not satisfied any of the conditions.
- The application concentrates development away from Centre Street, which is against the ASP guidelines as well as the Langdon Centre Street design guidelines currently under review.
- There is currently 300+ acres of "mixed use" land within the approved ASP that can accommodate a business industrial campus. Again, this approved area should be built out first.
- There are numerous other policies within the Langdon ASP that does not support this application such as policies 9, 10, 11, 15, 22, 27
- The proposed application is against the County plan Hamlet design policies, as noted within policies 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8.
- The application also contravenes the County Plan policy 14.13 Hamlet Business

Areas, which states that "planning and design of a hamlet business area shall be guided by the hamlet area structure plan".

I hope you take the above comments into consideration and will not support the application.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the above comments further, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED].

Regards,

Ryan & Meghan McKenzie

From: ABryden@rockyview.ca <ABryden@rockyview.ca>

Sent: January 21, 2020 8:29 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Public Notice - Division 4 - SE 21-23-27 W4M - Redesignation from AH to B-I

Hi Ryan,

The applicant has not provided any additional information or rationale to support the redesignation application. I have not yet completed my review of the application; however, at first glance there does not seem to be policy support and Administration would likely recommend refusal.

Let me know if you have any additional comments or questions.

Regards,
Andrea Bryden

From: MeghanandRyan McKenzie <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 10:04 AM

To: Andrea Bryden <ABryden@rockyview.ca>

Subject: Public Notice - Division 4 - SE 21-23-27 W4M - Redesignation from AH to B-I

Hi Andrea,

I reviewed a public notice for an application of transitioning a portion of SE 21-23-27 W4M from agricultural holdings to a business industrial use. This land is located just west of the town of Langdon. Is there any more information available on this?

Since this land is not within any planning area, nor has there been any public consultation on this, can you disclose whether this application is going forwards with a recommendation of refusal to council? Any additional information you can provide would be appreciated.

Regards,

Ryan Mckenzie

February 01, 2020

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

Reference: File Number 03221001
Application Number PL20190179
Division 4

Attention: Andrea Bryden
Planning Services Department

Dear Ms. Bryden

We received a Landowner 'notice letter' in regards to an application for re-designating a portion of adjacent farm land, from Ranch and Farm to Business Industrial to accommodate an unknown development, as per the above mentioned File Number and Application Number for Division 4.

We are opposed to the re-designation of this farm land to Industrial.
We are opposed to the re-designation to accommodate an 'unknown' development.

We are aware of the other adjacent land owner, across the road on Vale View Road, on the east side, owned by Qualico Developments, and their conceptual residential plan named Painted Sky. Which, as we all know, has not yet been incorporated into the Langdon Structure Plan. This future development by Qualico will be opposed to the above mentioned application too.

This re-designation from Farm to possible unknown 'Industrial' may bring in unsuitable businesses adjacent to a new upcoming residential area, as well as it will be too close to the current residents of Langdon.

If approved, this application will not only lower property values to this new area and to other areas surrounding it, it will more than likely stop people from wanting to move into the Langdon area due to the close proximity of 'unsuitable' industrial business(es).

Most 'industrial' businesses should only be allowed outside of a town district, AND away from residential areas.

We are opposed to the re-designation of this farm land to Industrial.

Regards

Robert & Tracey Brander

October 31, 2022

ATTN:
Jasmine Kaur
Planner, Rocky View County
Via e-mail

Reference: Bylaw C-7979-2020 Letter of Opposition

Dear Ms. Kaur:

Qualico is strongly opposed to application PL20190179. (Bylaw C-7979-2020) There are several reasons that Council should refuse this application.

1. County Planning Policy does not support the proposal.

The subject lands are located outside the Hamlet of Langdon, in an agricultural area. According to the Langdon Area Structure Plan, these lands are part of a Future Study Area, that may be considered as part of a hamlet expansion when Langdon is approaching full buildout. This process would involve a comprehensive assessment of several factors and include considerable public engagement in order to plan for future development in this area. This application is premature. Even if a hamlet expansion was being considered we would not support an industrial land use in this location.

2. The proposed land use is incompatible with adjacent land uses within the hamlet.

The proposal is to convert agricultural land to industrial, and it is located immediately adjacent to a new residential community. Qualico is building the community of Painted Sky to the east, on the other side of Vale View Road, inside the hamlet of Langdon. Non-residential land uses of an industrial nature interfere with residential development. Industrial and non-residential land uses are almost exclusively found on the east edge of the hamlet, or adjacent to Centre Street.

3. No public engagement has been conducted and the proposal does not include any details.

We are not aware of the details of the proposal and cannot comment more directly to the impact it will have on the community of Painted Sky. There was no public engagement that we are aware of, and no additional information has been shared with us. This is a fundamental piece of any land use application that is missing. Which specific uses within

Reference: Bylaw C-7979-2020 Letter of Opposition

October 31, 2022

Page 2 of 2

the Industrial, Light District are being proposed? Why is the proposed site 45 acres? To be clear, engagement and dialogue with the applicant would not change our position on the proposal.

In closing, Qualico has invested considerable time, money and resources on the planning and development of the community of Painted Sky, which brings new amenities and residents to Langdon. To approve an ad-hoc industrial land use next to an actively developing residential community would be detrimental to Painted Sky and the Hamlet of Langdon as a whole.

Sincerely,

West Langdon Developments Ltd.

By its managing partner,

Qualico Developments West Ltd.



Ben Mercer

Director, Planning & Community Engagement