

ASP Comments Received – Pre Public Hearing

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

From: Landowner 1

Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2014 12:40 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Subject: Acheson Industrial structure plan

Good afternoon,

I am writing you to voice my upset with the Acheson Industrial Area Structure plan and how it negatively effects my family and our family property.

I do not understand why you are planning to rezone us as Restricted Agricultural, and would like an explanation. Our family, and our neighbours, are all very upset and concerned with the future plans the county is making to the detriment of our family properties.

Please contact me either by email or mail, with the research substantiating this new zoning plan.

I would like it to be noted that we are against this change.

Sincerely,
Landowner 1

On Oct 16, 2014, at 12:14 PM, Martin Frigo <mfrigo@parklandcounty.com> wrote:

Hi

I really do appreciate the concerns that you have with the potential changes to the Acheson ASP - and the concerns that you neighbours may have. Here are my comments on why the County is looking at these potential changes:

1. Parkland County has met extensively (six facilitated meetings between May to September) with the City of Spruce Grove to discuss their issues with the Draft ASP. As background, Spruce Grove had some outstanding issues with the Draft ASP from 2012, that the County needed to address before we went back to the Capital Region Board. One such issue was the lands around the Wagner Natural Area.
2. Spruce Grove is not in favour of intensive land uses on lands around the Wagner Natural Area. Their concerns are with the protection of Wagner Natural Area, the Recharge Zone - AND future land use compatibility coming up to their borders. Spruce Grove would support these lands staying agricultural in nature. Parkland County also at this time does not contemplate more intensive land uses in this area (i.e. why re removed the original idea of looking at these lands as Industrial) due to proximity to Wagner.
3. The AGR redistricting would further protect lands around Wagner NA from more non-compatible land uses allowed as "discretionary uses" under the AGG districting. The AGR districting also limits more

future subdivisions (under the AGR districting you would be at your limit versus 1 additional parcel currently allowed in the AGG districting).

4. Spruce Grove may be looking eastward for future annexation - as such maintaining these lands as agricultural - and in AGR would benefit any future annexation for Spruce.

5. This redistricting would only occur if the ASP was passed - this is the current recommendation in the ASP. If the ASP was passed, the County would need to do a Land Use Bylaw redistricting and another Public Hearing.

NOTE: Permitted uses are also the same from the AGG to AGR districting. This means that your current uses (single dwelling unit) is still the same -and there are not changes to this use.

Other notes:

The County is hosting a second Public Open House on November 6th at Council Chambers - 6:30 - 9 PM. The same information provided to you in the September letter will be presented, with some minor text and mapping revisions. If you so desire, you can attend this meeting. If you have major concerns - you can also write me a letter with your concerns and opposition. These letters are shared with all Senior staff - and Council is made aware of them.

>

> I also encourage you to attend the Public Hearing date for the ASP. Right now, the date is not confirmed, but we are tentatively looking at the third week of December. I can get you this date once it is confirmed.

Good morning Martin,

Thank you for the email. I apologize for not returning your phone call, I am not home during the day and wasn't available at lunch time.

I have a couple more questions that I hope you can answer.

I understand that this zoning change is still in the process of being passed but in your opinion,

- What is the county's plan for our property? I have read though the ASP and am still unsure of the exact use. Pipeline, road way, reserved natural area to protect Wagner ?

- What type of use will be approved for our land if we choose not to farm it?

- What impact will the zoning change have on the saleability of my property?

- With all the upcoming changes, Is the county prepared to buy our property?

My concerns are pretty straight forward.

This property is to be our home, then our retirement, and finally our childrens inheritance. If the County makes changes that affect our potential income from either developing or selling the property in the future we need to stand against the changes.

I appreciate you taking the time to answer my questions.

Sincerely
Landowner 1

From: Martin Frigo
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 3:51 PM
To: Landowner 1
Subject: Follow-up with you.

HI - sorry for getting back to you late. Here are my responses.

Good morning Martin,

Thank you for the email. I apologize for not returning your phone call, I am not home during the day and wasn't available at lunch time.

What is the county's plan for our property? I have read though the ASP and am still unsure of the exact use. Pipeline, road way, reserved natural area to protect Wagner ?

We have no plans for your property outside its current uses (i.e. your residential home and agricultural / grazing uses). The Draft ASP does indicate a potential road connection east of your property - this is the potential (future) extension of Grove Drive. That said, Spruce Grove is opposed to this. There is no indication when this road would be developed as well (probably not for a real long time). There would also be lots of issues around the road dealing with Wagner Natural Area and other land owners.

What type of use will be approved for our land if we choose not to farm it?

You currently have permitted uses under the AGG Districting. Under the proposed changes, you would have permitted uses under the AGR Districting. These are the same permitted uses. You would have slightly less "discretionary" uses allowed under the AGR Districting (ex. no Home Based Business 3). Discretionary uses are uses that the Development Officer may or may not issue a permit. I am attaching for you a table showing the permitted and discretionary uses for each District (AGG and AGR).

What impact will the zoning change have on the saleability of my property?

Your lands are currently farmland with a residential home on it. Under the proposed changes your lands will still be primarily agricultural. The more direct impact would be the subdivision. Again, the current regulation would allow you 1 additional subdivision under AGG. The AGR designation would put you at your limit. That said, as stated - the County doesn't see these lands having more intensive uses in the future (i.e. industrial or county residential subdivisions) due to proximity to Wagner Natural Area and proximity to Spruce Grove.

I also chatted with our Assessment staff. As they explained, land values don't "crash" due to a sudden zoning change. Assessment values are based on current uses on the land (i.e. your home is an "improvement" on the land - and the balance is assessed at a regulated farmland assessment rate). Our assessor stated that there would be no loss in your current assessment if we went to AGR. Assessment is also based on what is happening adjacent to your property. Being close to Spruce Grove may benefit these (and your) lands if Spruce does keep developing residentially.

If you have any more questions on assessment, please feel free to contact Ron Van Dam – one of our assessors at rvandam@parklandcounty.com.

With all the upcoming changes, Is the county prepared to buy our property?

The County does not buy out properties when rezoning occurs. Your lands are primarily agricultural with an improvement on it (your home). If the redistricting to AGR was to occur this situation does not change.

My concerns are pretty straight forward. This property is to be our home, then our retirement, and finally our childrens inheritance. If the County makes changes that affect our potential income from either developing or selling the property in the future we need to stand against the changes.

I understand your concerns. The true value of your lands may be in the future (possibly 10-15 years out) if the area expands industrially (Acheson) and residentially (Spruce Grove).

I appreciate you taking the time to answer my questions.

Sincerely
Landowner 1

From: Landowner 2

Sent: Monday, October 20, 2014 12:00 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Cc: Paul Hanlan; Jessica Karpo;

Subject: RE: Acheson Area Structure Plan - November 6th - Second Open House

Thank you Martin

I am concerned about the zoning applied to my land, Agricultural is fine , but the restricted really hurts the value.

I know that my surrounding neighbours share the same concern, if you could share some light on this it would be great.

Landowner 2

From: Landowner 3

Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 7:49 AM

To: Jackie McCuaig

Cc: Rod Shaigec; Duncan Martin; Martin Frigo; phanlon@parklandcounty.com

Subject: Concerns Regarding the Proposed ASP 2014

We are writing you this email to inform you that we are strongly opposed to the re-zoning of our property and the property surrounding us from AGG to AGR. The value of properties in Osborne Acres has been stagnant or lowered due to constant limbo condition of proposed changes while surrounding lands increase in value.

We feel strongly that the County should leave the zoning as it currently is at AGG

The rezoning of these lands to AGR will have a large negative impact on the value of our property. It will leave our property in limbo and make it very difficult to sell should we ever choose to do so.

Our thought is that the County should leave Agricultural Area A zoned as AGG and make Osborne Acres a Country Residential work/Live District. This is beneficial to the County and residents for several reasons.

First, Osborne Acres is adjacent to Acheson and so CRWL zoning is a good transition from Industrial to AGG or CR zoning.

Second, presently there is an unmet need in Parkland County for acreage properties where people can operate a small business without the onerous cost of buying industrial land in Acheson.

Third, the value of properties in Osborne Acres under a CRWL zoning would likely increase significantly ,thus increase the tax revenue for the County and provide residents with a better property value.

We would welcome the opportunity to speak to you in person or over the phone about this re-zoning. If you wish you may contact (name removed) on cell phone at i.

Thank you,
Landowner 3

From: Martin Frigo <mfrigo@parklandcounty.com>

Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 at 9:45 AM

To:

Subject: RE: Acheson Area Structure Plan - November 6th - Second Open House

Find attached my comments in red. We did undertake several changes to the Draft ASP as per your request.

ASI's Requested Changes to ASP-2014 Draft

Given the aforementioned, ASI respectfully requests the following changes to the Acheson Structural Plan – 2014 Draft in order to ensure the document recognizes ASI's existence, and to ensure that development conditions pursuant to ASI's Jan 2014 amendment to Bylaw 20-2009 are recognized by the ASP-2014.

pg. 16 - Sec 5.2 Highway 628 re–alignment – Insert: “With the exception of the existing development by Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd. On Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Development Plan 9420960, SW28-52-26-W4M,” ... Development of these lands is premature ...

The following sentence was added (under the “Constrained Lands” section for Highway 628 re-alignment) -

Highway 628 re-alignment (513.9 ha)

Eight quarter-sections north of Highway 628 are premature for development due to Alberta Transportation's plans to re-align Highway 628 between the City of Edmonton and the Town of Stony Plain. Construction of the re-alignment is outside of the three-year construction program from Alberta

Transportation. In addition, the land acquisition for lands west of Highway 60 has not been completed to date. Development of these lands is premature until Alberta Transportation has completed all land acquisitions for the re-alignment. Lands in this category do not include Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd. located on Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Plan 9420960 (SW 28-52-26-W4M). Future expansion of these lands will require prior Alberta Transportation approval and need to comply with all policies outlined in the ASP.

Pg. 25 – Sec 5.4 Provincial Highway 628 – Insert: “With the exception of the existing development by Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd. On Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Development Plan 9420960, SW28-52-26-W4M,” The proposed Future Land Use Concept Map (Figure 6)

The recommended alignment option (Figure 12 – Future Transportation Improvements) proposes that the freeway right of way be located approximately 400 metres to the north of the existing right of way. The proposed Future Land Use Concept Map (Figure 6) recommends that the land adjacent to Provincial Highway 628 be considered “constrained” (with the exception of the existing development of Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd. located on Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Plan 9420960) until all land acquisitions for Provincial Highway 628 in the ASP area has been acquired and detailed construction drawings approved by Alberta Transportation. Any future expansion of Alberta Spruce Industries will require prior Alberta Transportation approval and need to comply with all policies outlined in the ASP).

- Figure 5 – Designate ASI’s property as Developed Land (shaded yellow), without the designation of Constrained Lands. Refer to aforementioned Acclaim property
We have put the 2 ASI parcels in the yellow – “existing developed land” category and removed the constrained cross hatching.
- Figure 6 – Remove ASI’s property from the designation of Outside ASP Timelines – remove blue cross hatch lines from ASI in Figure 6. Refer to aforementioned Acclaim property
We have placed the 2 ASI parcels in the pink – “business industrial designation – and removed the constrained cross hatching as requested.
- Figure 15 – Designate ASI’s property as S-1 in recognition of it’s existing development. Refer to aforementioned Acclaim property
The County has not put your lots in S1 designation on this map. S1 development highlights lots where future development and redevelopment opportunities are immediate (within 0-24 months). That means, full municipal servicing can be provided in the short term, and AT approvals are imminent.

Any changes to existing land uses on your lot (for industrial development or redevelopment expansion purposes) outside of current LUB approvals will require future municipal servicing and AT roadside approvals. Our understanding is that municipal servicing is over a quarter section away for both water and sanitary services for your lands. As well – as mentioned above - you would still require AT approvals for any new access points or improvements to existing accesses if you were going to change uses.

We have adequately changed the ASP as you requested to designate your lands as “existing, industrial development”. As well, we have identified your lands with a future industrial designation in Figure 6 – Future

Land Use Concept. If you feel that we haven't address enough of your concerns, I recommend you call Paul to discuss further. Lastly, by not having your lands in S1 does not limit your ability to seek future development / expansion. If the ASP was to proceed, you could proceed outside of the staging by complying with Draft Policy 7.1.2.6 which allows development "outside of the development staging" by undertaking the number of criteria listed.

PS – we have also removed the Acclaim site from the S1 timeframe. Their ultimate development (owned by PennWest) is outside the 10 years we have identified in the Draft ASP.

Regards,

Martin

Good morning again Martin;

I went back through my notes from a meeting with (name removed) approx 1 year ago. At that meeting the issue of services (water and sewer) were discussed with respect to ASI and future development. My notes indicate that there was general agreement for the notion of ASI tying into services when they became available, and making that a condition of future development, should that development occur prior to the services being available.

I am wondering if we could formalize that notion with a Letter of Understanding, that would essentially say that ASI could development our lands in accordance with the Land Use Bylaw, and specifically the January 14 Amendment to Bylaw 20-2009 with the proviso that any development would be required to tie into water and sewer services when they are available to serve the ASI site(s).

I think this would clearly set out development conditions on ASI lands and recognizes the requirements set forth in the Land Use Bylaw. What are your thoughts?

Landowner 4

Hi Martin,

Speaking on behalf of our family.

Upon reviewing the proposed zoning of our property's SW 28-52-26w4 and SE 29-52-26w4 as it relates to the Acheson area structure plan.

I'd like an explanation as to why it also will not be changed to light industrial, commercial development land?

I realize that a portion has to be set aside for the future redevelopment of highway #628 and this has already been surveyed and property acquired by Alberta transportation as it relates to their surveyed plans as shown in your Acheson area structure plan.

You know and have the surveyed plans for the highway so tell me why at the very least the light industrial zoning designation should not be up to the 628 road allowance as you've done along highways #60 and #16x and the CN rail line?

Best regards,

Landowner 5

Parkland County response:

Part of the reason lies with ongoing AT work (in acquiring rights-of-way) and part of it is location from existing developments north of you in Acheson. While AT has acquired some of the right-of-way west of Highway 60, I believe not all of it has been completed yet. In addition, the extension of water and sanitary servicing from already existing industrial properties in Acheson is still at least a mile away from your lands. The proposed 2014 ASP (and the existing 1997 ASP) requires all new industrial and commercial developments to be fully serviced by municipal water and sanitary. I would recommend that the lands north of you be allowed to develop firstly (which they are still vacant from development) - and let these developers offset the cost of pulling servicing down closer to your lands versus you having to pull servicing extensions down at your cost. This may be another 10 years or so.

The County has always been for the opinion that your lands (after right of way is taken out) would be either future industrial or commercial development. We just need to get the servicing down closer to you – and get the AT stuff better sorted.

I have changed the ASP to state the future industrial / commercial potential of these lands:

Highway 628 re-alignment (513.9 ha)

Eight quarter-sections north of Highway 628 are premature for development due to Alberta Transportation's plans to re-align Highway 628 between the City of Edmonton and the Town of Stony Plain. Construction of the re-alignment is outside of the three-year construction program from Alberta Transportation. In addition, the land acquisition for lands east and west of Highway 60 has not been completed to date. Development of these lands is premature until Alberta Transportation has completed all land acquisitions for the re-alignment. Lands in this category do not include Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd. located on Lot 2 and Lot 3 of Plan 9420960 (SW 28-52-26-W4M). Future expansion of these lands will require prior Alberta Transportation approval and need to comply with all policies outlined in the ASP. Parkland County expects that resultant lands remaining once the Highway 628 road alignment has been acquired will be identified for future industrial and commercial development opportunities. This will be reviewed at the next update to the ASP by Parkland County.

Again, we will review the status of the Highway 628 development - and where servicing is in respect of your lands at the next ASP update. Hopefully by then we can better incorporate timelines for your lands development.

Martin

From: Landowner 6

Date: October 28, 2014 at 2:39:13 PM MDT

To: "mfrigo@parlandcounty.com" <mfrigo@parlandcounty.com>

Subject: Acheson Area Structure Plan

Parkland County

c/o Martin Frigo Senior Planner-Long Range Planning

As per phone call on Oct 24, 2014

We, owners of (name removed) property consisting of approximately 30 acres former (name removed) Poultry Farm, we purchased this property in December 2003.

We strongly oppose the Draft Acheson Area Structure Plan Policies For Agriculture Area A.

We feel we should not be included into the Agriculture Restricted District Agriculture Area A restricted and constrained land use because we are south of the CN Railway and north of Hwy 16A man made boundaries. Anything south of the man made CN Railway boundary and North of Hwy 16A should not be included in the Agriculture Area A.

(name removed) property is as much commercial or industrial as agricultural, there is no cultivated land on this property.

A bit of history of the (name removed) farm has been here for 50-60 years, and it is an old facility difficult to operate on the busy 4- lane Hwy 16A, having several semi-trucks coming and going day and night, difficult access of the Hwy 16A, there has been one accident and many close calls coming and going from this property.

We have been in the planning of relocating this site to (name removed) County and we currently just finished rebuilding the first half of this phase of relocating, hoping to recover some of the cost by selling this property in the future.

We are Strongly opposed to be classified as Agriculture Area A restricted and constrained land.

We are NOT part of the wildlife corridor

We are NOT part of natural area

We are NOT part of recharge system

We are NOT part of the buffer zone.

We are Not part of the trail system all because of the man made CN Railway and Hwy 16A boundary.

Landowners 6

November 6, 2014

PARKLAND COUNTY
Planning and Development Services
53109A Hwy 779
Parkland County, Alberta
T7Z 1R1

Attention: Mr. Martin Frigo, RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner, Long Range Planning

Dear Sir:

Re: Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan DRAFT [November 2014 – Version 6 (Final)]

Further to our meeting of September 30th, 2014 [Frigo/Hanlan/.....] and my attendance at the Draft Acheson ASP Open House on October 6th, 2014, this letter will advise that I have now had an opportunity to review the Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan DRAFT November 2014 Version 6 [Final] and have the following comments relative to the lands I own in the NE 6 & SE 6-53-26-W4.

1. I am pleased to see that Parkland County has seen the wisdom in designating that portion of my land in the SE 6-53-26-W4 and those lands west of mine, all of which are located south of the CNR tracks and north of Highway 16A, as **BI – Business Industrial**. These lands are a logical extension to the Business Industrial Development located to the east and we all agree are not integral to the lands north of the CNR tracks.
2. I see that Parkland County has not altered its position respecting my lands in the NE 6 and a portion of the SE 6-53-26-W4 which lie north of the CNR tracks in **Agricultural Area A**. **Figure 5** designates these lands as **Environmental & Land Constraints (Limited Development)** and Parkland County intends to redistrict these lands from **AGG – Agricultural General** to **AGR - Agricultural Restricted**. I am vehemently opposed to the redistricting of my lands to AGR as it is paramount to "expropriation without compensation"!
3. The **AGR** District:
 - (a) Restricts/limits my agricultural pursuits.
 - (b) Restricts further subdivision opportunities on my lands; the **AGG** District would allow for the subdivision of up to four (4) parcels per quarter section.

- (c) Requires me to comply with ALL Regulations and Policies contained in the ASP.
 - (d) May require me to conduct a hydrological and hydrogeological study to support a Development Permit Application on my lands.
4. My lands shall continue to be designated **AGR** [6.9.5.3] until policies 6.9.5.1 and 6.9.5.2 are completed [page 56]. 6.9.5.1 commits Parkland County to undertake an ecological study of the **Agricultural Area A** lands but does not stipulate a completion date. In 6.9.5.2 Parkland County "reserves the right" to undertake any additional ecological, biophysical and hydrogeological studies it deems appropriate for **Agricultural Area A**. The County recognizes the significance of these studies in protecting the environmentally sensitive areas but will not commit to undertaking these studies at its own cost. Why not?
5. There is much speculation that **Agricultural Area A** is being designated as such in the Acheson ASP to garnish the support of the City of Spruce Grove. Given the City of Spruce Grove's limited growth potential, the general consensus by the affected landowners in **Agricultural Area A** is Spruce Grove wants to annex the **Agricultural Area A** lands in the future. To appease Spruce Grove and because Parkland County wants this ASP approved by the Capital Region Board [CRB] of which the City of Spruce Grove is a member, **Agricultural Area A** was created.

If the City of Spruce Grove does in fact want to annex **Agricultural Area A**, why doesn't Parkland County and the City of Spruce Grove be transparent in expressing their respective goals and make such an application to the Province of Alberta without using us, the landowners, as pawns in the process? Why?

I intend to be present at this evening's Open House to discuss these points with my neighbours in **Agricultural Area A**. I understand most of them have been in contact with Parkland County regarding their concerns and my understanding is all of them are opposed to the redistricting of our respective lands to **AGR**. I reiterate I am opposed to such a District

I can be contacted at _____ to discuss my concerns in greater detail if Parkland County so desires.

Thank you.

Yours truly, 

cc: Mayor Rod Shaigec
Councillor Jackie McCuaig, Division 2
Pat Vincent, CAO, Parkland County
Paul Hanlan, Parkland County
_____ Real Estate Ltd.

From: Developer 1
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 4:46 PM
To: Martin Frigo
Cc: Peter Vana; Paul Hanlan;
Subject: Acheson Industrial Area ASP - 2014
Importance: High

Martin,

I am not sure if I will make it to the Open House tomorrow evening but I do have a few comments/concerns that I would appreciate being considered. It would be preferable to deal with them now rather than at the Public Open House in Council.

Page 6.

Enhance open space opportunities by maximizing the use of Municipal and Environmental Reserve areas for community and recreational uses, and new trail networks.

Trails in industrial developments are not used and cause increased costs to lot purchasers and increased costs of maintenance to the Municipality.

Page 14

The CNR's mail line transects typo, should be "main"

Check for typos throughout ie. kilometers should be kilometres (one on page 16 but may be more)

Storm Servicing

Concern that current proposals are not following the Master Drainage Plan yet the ASP calls for it to happen.

This access requires final approval from Alberta Transportation (see Figure 10 – Future Transportation Improvements). Should be **Figure 12**

Provincial Highway 16A

Provincial Highway 16A is classified as a Major Expressway with accesses onto Bevington Road Acheson Road, Pinchbeck Road, RR 264 (south of Highway 16A), Sandhills and Atim Road intersections scheduled to be closed in the future by Alberta Transportation.

Should be "may be closed" or "are under consideration for being closed". I don't think that determination has been made but I could be wrong.

Page 31

The timing for the conversion of agricultural lands for commercial and industrial purposes shall comply with Section 7 and Figure 15 – Development Staging.

Should change to "are encouraged". You don't want to preclude a major development from coming in that may not fall in sequence with the Staging.

Page 37

6.1.2.28 Require an Outline Plan as part of the subdivision application or redistricting process. Outline Plans shall conform to the County's Outline Plans Policy and Procedures.

Add wording at the start of the sentence to the effect: "If an Outline Plan does not exist for a development area, require an Outline Plan as part of the subdivision application or

redistricting process. Outline Plans shall conform to the County's Outline Plans Policy and Procedures."

Page 44

6.4.2.11 Encourage Alberta Transportation to review the Zone 3 access at Range Road 264, and to keep the right-in/right-out access open to traffic.

add **"and encourage Alberta Transportation to retain a right-in/right-out access open to traffic for Bevington Road in Zone 4 in the event that all directional access is removed."**

Page 53

6.8.2.9 Incorporate trails into the construction of new stormwater management facilities. Trail construction should comply with Municipal Engineering Standards and the recommendations from the 2009 Recreation, Parks and Open Space Master Plan.

As mentioned above, trails don't work in Industrial subdivisions. Rather than **"Incorporate"** say **"Encourage"**

6.8.2.11 Investigate the potential of entering into capital contribution agreements with developers to offset costs for the expansion and maintenance of public recreational amenities in the ASP area.

This is not permitted under the MGA and should be taken out.

Page 58

(d) all on-site decommissioning or land reclamation required on a particular site has been completed and copies of reclamation certificates provided to Parkland County;

There is nothing that compels an oil company to reclaim a lease site once abandoned. There are a few in NW 11 that have been abandoned since 1956 and are not yet reclaimed. This should be removed as a criteria.

Figure 5

Please show the W ½ 11-53-26 W4 as Available for Development. This area has water and sanitary sewer adjacent to it and we are currently under design for subdivision of this area, working with the existing well sites.

The Penn West Label; should be moved south of the tracks and on the west side of that section.

Figure 6

Please show the W ½ 11-53-26 W4 as Future BI along Bevington Road and MI behind.

Figure 10

The E-W line on the middle of Section 11 should follow Parkland Ave.

Not sure what the little extensions are west of Bevington Road all the way down? There will be service connections but not trunks.

Figure 12

Show the stars as "Possible Highway Access Closures"

Figure 15

All of the small lot areas in Section 10 should be S1 as they are immediately developable.

Please change W ½ 11 to S1 as that is an area we are moving to develop likely next year.

Thank you for your consideration to my comments. Others may also respond to you directly.

Sincerely,

Developer 1

From: Stakeholder 1

Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 2:50 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Subject: Acheson ASP -

Hello Martin,

I have been thinking about: **1)** the proposed Acheson ASP (2014); **2)** future development in/around Wagner; **3)** the work that has gone into the County's ECMP; and **4)** the recent meeting held between Osborne Acres residents and the landowner who recently bought land directly south of Osborne Acres and now wants to develop it.

I am concerned that, without some kind of **ongoing environmental oversight** within the Acheson ASP area, it won't be possible to actually achieve the stated environmental goals for the Wagner area (i.e., protection of groundwater sources, water quality, wetland conservation in Acheson, habitat connectivity, etc.).

In particular, the proposed Acheson ASP deals with development issues at the *broadest level* within the ASP area. Although it has a number of very positive elements in it with respect to conservation in and around Wagner, the problem is that development proposals/approval decisions are (in reality) made in an incremental, day by day, and case by case basis over a longer period of time by a variety of different landowners and planners. These individual decisions are typically made in isolation from each other, on/for each separate parcel of land, and without reference to the overall effect on the ecosystem of the area. The overall environmental effect of this incremental parcel by parcel development is often only apparent after the fact (i.e., too late) and it can have a very significant (and negative) *cumulative effect*. Further, most land use planners don't have a professional or academic background in ecology/conservation biology/conservation planning/environmental planning --- or the time to research, design, or evaluate more environmentally sensitive alternatives that would allow for better integration of conservation with other land uses.

I am not sure, as a result, how Parkland County will be able to monitor, evaluate, or mitigate the cumulative effects of development in Acheson and near Wagner. . .and/or guide more environmentally appropriate development.

I know that municipalities hire land use planners in significant numbers, but I was wondering if Parkland County has ever considered adding an environmental/conservation planner to its staff --- even on a part-time basis ?

. An environmental planner/conservation planner is defined here as a professional with a significant academic background in ecology and who would work on a team with land use planners to mitigate/minimize the effects of development and integrate land conservation with other land uses on a day by day basis.

It would allow the County to:

- better prevent/minimize/mitigate the effects of development on the ecosystem
- research and identify workable and environmentally meaningful alternatives
- create and implement new patterns of development working with different landowners
- monitor and guide the cumulative effect of development with an eye to maintaining the environmental values the County has identified for Acheson, Wagner, and its other environmentally significant areas
- could become part of a positive mechanism to involve landowners in conservation during development

Environmental planning (applied ecology) is a specialty just as land use planning and engineering are, and it just seems to me that having those skills on-board/available on an ongoing basis would be a solid asset for the County.

Food for thought hopefully it is not presumptuous of me to suggest that this might be worth considering.

I will be attending the November 6th Open House on the Acheson ASP.

Yours truly,
Stakeholder 1

From: Former Landowner 1

Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 2:06 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Cc:

Subject: AASP

Martin,

I was sorry to miss the AASP Open House that was held last night. As a 36-year resident of Osborne Acres and as a director of the Wagner Natural Area Society, I do still have concerns regarding the AASP. I hope you don't mind my expressing these concerns in an email.

1. Figure 11 - drainage. The course of the two branches of Morgan Creek is shown incorrectly. This incorrect mapping could cause confusion in the future. I am also concerned that the map continues to show drainage into Morgan Creek from south of Highway 16A. It was my understanding that all drainage

from south of 16A into Morgan Creek would be discontinued at some future date. If that is still true, there should be a mention of that future change in the AASP.

2. Figure 5 - This map shows depressional areas, but ONLY south of the railroad tracks. I am concerned that no depressional areas are shown north of the railroad tracks. In particular, the ravines and small ponds south of Osborne Acres are not shown as depressional areas. Are ravines, depressional areas and water courses (eg. Morgan Creek) included in "constrained lands"? What protection for ravines and water courses is included in the AASP?

3. Policy 7.1.2.6 At what stage of a development application must a developer obtain AB Transportation approval?

4. Policy 6.7.2.9 and 6.8.2.6. The way these points are written and the addition of these points in this draft of the AASP indicate to me that Parkland County has made these changes to accommodate a developer.

5. There should be a provision somewhere in the AASP to require yearly measurement of the erosion in Morgan Creek. Since the Acheson/Big Lake Drainage Plan was approved, there have been, to my knowledge, no additional measurements undertaken to establish the continuing rate of erosion in Morgan Creek. If a development is going to add more drainage water to Morgan Creek, these erosion measurements must be kept up to date. In addition, it might be time to start taking routine water chemistry profiles of Morgan Creek water AND the water coming into Osborne Acres (and Wagner Natural Area) through other water courses.

6. Future Transportation. What is the purpose of the future road indicated by the yellow arrow and dotted line just south of Wagner Natural Area? And why is this future road shown in this location and not farther south?

Thank you for any answers you can provide.

Sincerely,

Former Landowner

From: Landowner 1

Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 11:03 AM

To: Martin Frigo

Subject: Comment from last night's Open House

Martin,

It was great to meet you last night.

I noticed that in your ASP you talk about developing a regional trail network throughout the ASP. At the same time I also saw that you are proposing the potential for a trail in the industrial use setback to the south of our property.

I thought it might be prudent for the County to consider enforcing a requirement for developers to install a Shared-Use-Path system inside the road right-of-ways as they build the roads through the industrial areas. This would be very similar to what the City of Edmonton has done through a number of their developments (consider the commercial/industrial area along 142 ST). Based on what I've seen on the roads through the industrial areas, there is plenty of room within the ROW to install these paths, while still leaving a lot of room for all shallow utilities. The deeps could be installed either below the SUP, or below the roadway itself. The capital cost to a developer to install this SUP would be minimal when contrasting to the County doing this work as a separate project. I also presume that maintenance of the infrastructure would be considerably less difficult, as you could refurbish the SUP with much easier access. It would also allow the setback south of our properties to remain more natural.

I know that the residents within (subdivision) are concerned with a pathway that runs along the back of our properties. Such a solution as proposed above would be of great benefit to the County and remove a potential threat from us residents, while the cost to the developer would be negligible. I don't believe the developer would even need to increase the size of the road ROW, although I admit I haven't studied your roadway cross-section requirements in detail yet.

Please consider this as development moves forward in our area. Thank you for your time.