

**Written Submissions for Public Hearing**  
**Bylaw 2022-13 Springbank Park Estates Redistricting**  
*(received prior to 4:00 p.m. on August 19, 2022)*

**Agency Comments:**

- Attachment 1 – ATCO Gas
- Attachment 2 – Alberta Health Services
- Attachment 3 – Alberta Transportation

**Adjacent Landowner Comments:**

- Attachment 4
- Attachment 5
- Attachment 6
- Attachment 7
- Attachment 8

# Attachment 1

**From:** [Mendoza, John](#)  
**To:** [Jessica Harnden](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Public Hearing Notice: Bylaw 2022-13 Springbank Park Estates  
**Date:** July 27, 2022 4:15:44 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.jpg](#)

You don't often get email from john.mendoza@atco.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Parkland County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize this sender and know the contents are safe.

Good Afternoon,

Please see the response below from our engineer:

The Engineering Design Department of ATCO Gas has reviewed the above named plan and has the following conditions:

- **For any appropriate Neighborhood Structure Plan/Area Structure Plan**  
ATCO Gas requires that a suitable alignment be provided within the boulevards of all arterial and major roads for the ATCO Gas feeder mains.
- **It WILL require a main installation - front lot easements required, cross out what may not apply**  
A gas main installation will be required. ATCO Gas requires front lot rights-of-way to serve the newly created lots. It is recommended that the owner / developer contact ATCO Gas Distribution Engineer [edmontongrowth@atco.com](mailto:edmontongrowth@atco.com) prior to approval of the subdivision if there's any question regarding the right-of-way requirements. ATCO Gas's Distribution Engineer may require plans suitable for registration showing the rights-of-way before the design work can begin from which it may take a minimum 4 months to design and obtain the necessary approvals for the gas main installation. All surveyor costs will be borne by the developer/owner.
- **If requesting a gas sleeve in advance**  
To avoid open cutting of road and conflicts with other utilities during construction, ATCO Gas requires that a PVC sleeve be provided by the developer / owner at the proposed road crossing locations. The locations will be confirmed at the same time any right-of-way requirements are identified. To ensure proper depth of cover, ATCO Gas cannot begin construction until the site is within 150mm of final grade along its alignments.

If you have any **questions or concerns regarding this reply**, please contact **Sid Satsangi** ([Sid.Satsangi@atco.com](mailto:Sid.Satsangi@atco.com), (780)-292-5974)

Sincerely,

**John Mendoza**

Summer Student – Administrative Support  
Distribution Engineering Growth  
Natural Gas Distribution

P. (780)-293-6237



Healthy Albertans.  
Healthy Communities.  
**Together.**



August 17, 2022

Parkland County  
Attn: Jessica Harnden, Senior Planner  
53109A Hwy 779  
Parkland County, AB  
T7Z 1R1

E-mail: [jessica.harnden@parklandcounty.com](mailto:jessica.harnden@parklandcounty.com)

Dear Jessica Harnden:

**RE: Bylaw 2022-13 Land Use Bylaw Amendment  
Springbank Park Estates  
Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 9820548 and Lot 1, Plan 9624168  
SW 16-53-26-W4M  
Parkland County File# PD-2022-001**

The land use bylaw amendment proposes redistricting 2 parcels (Lot 1, Plan 9624168 and Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 9820548) from the CR – Country Residential District to CRE – Country Residential Estate District. The redistricting will allow for 0.5 – 3.0 ac lots within the lands. These 2 parcels are on the west half of SW 16-53-26-W4M and will form Springbank Park Estates. Municipal water and sewer services will be provided.

During review of a previously submitted Conceptual Scheme for Springbank Park Estates and Royal Spring Estates the following reports were reviewed:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Trace Associates, Project No. 200-2937, October 28, 2019)
- Geotechnical Investigation (J.R. Paine & Associates Ltd., Report No. 5185-2, January 2020)
- Engineering Services Report (Whitenect Engineering Inc., January 28, 2021)

Alberta Health Services - Environmental Public Health has no concerns with the proposed land use bylaw amendment at this time.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Koreen Anderson".

Koreen Anderson, B.Sc., CPHI(C)  
Public Health Inspector / Executive Officer



**Construction and Maintenance Division**

North Central Region; Stony Plain  
 4709 - 44 Avenue Provincial Building & Courthouse ( Stony Plain )  
 Stony Plain  
 AB  
 T7Z1N4  
 (780) 968 4228  
[www.alberta.ca](http://www.alberta.ca)

August 25, 2022

File Number: RPATH0004229

Planning - Parkland County  
 53109A Highway 779  
 Parkland County Alberta  
 jessica.harnden@parklandcounty.com

**Subject: Municipal Referral - Planning Document**

Description	General Location
<p>File Number: PD-2022-001</p> <p>Bylaw No. 2022-13 Redistrict from the CR – Country Residential District to the CRE – Country Residential Estate District.</p> <p>Lot 1, Plan 962 4168 and Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 982 0548                      SW16-53-26- W4M                      North of Highway 16</p>	

This will acknowledge receipt of the above referenced document. Alberta Transportation’s primary concern is protecting the safe and effective operation of provincial highway infrastructure, and planning for the future needs of the highway network in the vicinity of the plan area.

**Alberta Transportation has the following additional comments and/or requirements with respect to this proposal:**

1. Alberta Transportation has no concerns with this proposed rezoning.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed plan.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Robert.Lindsay@gov.ab.ca

### **Bylaw 2022-13 – Land Use Bylaw Amendment, Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 982 0548 and Lot 1, Plan 962 4168 within SW-16-53-26-W4M**

Mayor, Councillors, Planning and Development,

It has been just under 7 months since this exact same land use amendment had been brought to Parkland County Council. On February 8, 2022 Bylaw 2021-27 was dealt with at a public hearing and was not supported. Is it the practice of developers to keep applying for rezoning until they are approved? Do we have to continually take time off work to oppose this rezoning? Everyone had the same opportunity to present to Council Chambers, a vote was held and the application was not approved.

The developer purchased the property knowing that Parkland County had an area structure plan in place with this area being CR County Residential. CRE Country Residential Estate properties are located mostly to the east of Hiway 60. With that in mind I feel the capability of developing 60ish lots on the 74 acre property sufficient to still make a profit on this development. The attempt to squeeze in 82 lots is just an attempt to squeeze out 22 more lot sales without any regard to the surrounding subdivisions.

Not only would rezoning double the amount of traffic coming from the subdivision I am also concerned about the water runoff. As it is already a problem to get overland water coverage in this area I think overdeveloping will add even more issues. As for the traffic at the intersection of Twp Rd 532A and Hiway 60 it is already a busy intersection with passenger vehicles as well as big trucks accessing the scales that adding even more vehicles will only make it more difficult to access your own home. Please find attached pictures of the traffic on August 17, 2022 around 4:00 pm.

Thank you for your consideration,

Gary Racich

████████████████████









Hand Delivered

August 16, 2022

Parkland County  
Planning & Development Services  
53109A Hwy 779  
Parkland County, AB  
T7Z 1R1



Dear Sir/Madam:

**Subject: Bylaw 2022-13 – Land Use Bylaw Amendment, Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 982 0548 and  
Lot 1, Plan 962 4168 within SW-16-53-26-W4M File No. PD-2022-001**

---

We are in receipt of the notice dated July 21, 2022, regarding an application to redistrict two parcels of land from CR-Country Residential, to CRE- Country Residential Estate District.

We are residents of Royal Spring Estates and are greatly concerned about the impact this will have on our neighbourhood, the broader community, and our personal interests.

We are recent residents, approximately 1 year, and did our due diligence prior to purchasing our property. Key attributes of the area include the 1-acre properties, the infrastructure, and the development plan in place.

Our express concerns include but are not limited to the following:

- The impact on existing transportation infrastructure. Traffic is already congested with heavy equipment and trucks at the intersection of TWP Rd 532 and Highway 60. Emergency access by fire, police, or medical services may be additionally compromised by further congestion.
- The current subdivisions are not yet fully developed. When they are, that will add to existing infrastructure capacity and safety concerns. Further density will not be beneficial.
- The local access road TWP 532A will be under further pressure with additional properties beyond what is already in the approved development plan.
- The water table is high, as is the insurance for water coverage. Additional development and hard surfaces will impact drainage both due to additional hard surface areas and direction of drainage and run off. We are concerned that potential flood damage may be a direct result of increased density and development.

- The approved development plan already provides for approximately 65 lots. I would presume the developer knew what they were buying through their own due diligence!
- The current approved development plan conforms to the neighbourhood as it has developed.
- A change to higher density usage is not consistent with the properties/neighbourhoods on either side of the subject property.
- There is no known expressed need of the County to justify a change to higher density, presumably leaving the ask to be the sole desire for profit by the developer while negatively impacting our neighbourhood, quality of life, and property values.
- Additional lots will require additional services from the County. What is the impact on taxes?
- Although we are relatively new residents, we have already been exposed to an application for rezoning only a few months ago. I would hope Parkland County processes would have appropriate protection for its residents from egregious efforts by developers to repeatedly pursue rezoning within only months of a previous application.
- We are not aware of anything that has changed or that the County has done that would make a rezoning more manageable from an infrastructure or quality of life perspective since the last denied redevelopment application earlier in 2022.
- We purchased our property with the expectation of eventually having a neighbour behind our property – not 2 or 3. This directly impacts our property attractiveness and value, as well as our quality of life in Parkland County.

We respectfully request Parkland County decline the request for redistricting these two parcels of land.

Yours truly,



Lorne and Sharilee Fossum



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jessica Harnden](#)  
**Subject:** BYLAW 2022-13  
**Date:** August 19, 2022 12:06:57 AM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Parkland County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize this sender and know the contents are safe.

Hello Jessica

As a resident of Walker Lake I am unhappy with this proposed bylaw. Cramming in half acre lots into this area will destroy the look and feel of this rural area, especially since these lots will be city style deep and not rural Style wide (such as Lakeridge). Adding more houses will also increase the traffic. We fought hard to have a 60 speed limit on the collector road, but most vehicles do not stick to it and enforcement is very rare. On many occasions I had to jump into the ditch when walking our dog. Having speeding golfers does not help either. You should also know that frequently people do not obey the stop signs in this area which dangerous for pedestrians and cars, and putting the subdivision entrance directly opposite to Walker Lake is a recipe for disaster. The next point is that Parkland is eliminating all the proposed foot paths citing some future strategy. Let's be honest here, if the developer doesn't put them in now (which will also be cheaper), we will never get any foot paths in this area.

Parkland needs to start to represent its residents and not give business (developer) carte blanche.

Please represent the residents and address the above concerns.

Thanks, Darren Shaw

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jessica Harnden](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2022-13 Spring Bank Estates  
**Date:** August 19, 2022 12:48:51 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Parkland County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize this sender and know the contents are safe.

Hello Jessica,

I live in Walker Lake Estates and unfortunately can't attend the public hearing. I would like to share a few thoughts with you.

- My first and foremost concern is **Safety**. I walk on the collector road with my dog nearly every day and it is a real safety hazard. Enforcement is not present and that road is used as an alternative to HW 16 and people speed like that. I was hit nearly twice (if you stick out your arm you will hit the passenger side mirror) and I talked to neighbours and they had similar experiences. Now with 82 more lots that means **at least 164 more cars** on this road.
- Traffic routing - Intersection right across from Walker Lake. That is the most convenient and cheapest solution for the developer, but the most dangerous too, especially being a pedestrian, how am I supposed to get across that intersection during rush hour traffic?
- Infrastructure - can sewer, water, road, and the other municipal infrastructure keep up with double the amount of homes than were originally planned when it was CR with 1.0 ac lot sizes?
- Developers - they are a business and they want to reap the biggest revenue out of this and if there is no way to influence what they have to do then they will do the minimum (like any business). So, the first 'shock' was to see the trails go from the original high gloss rough design. The reason why the properties are so narrow is to save on building roads and utility infrastructure. All just cost savings for them on our backs and cost (property value will go down with this).
- Trail Master Plan - how many years out is that and once the plan is done, there is budgeting, prioritization, construction, maintenance. So I will probably retire before I see any trail out here. How about getting the developer to put the trails in. We as residents usually maintain the trails (not pothole patching, but snow clearing, mowing, etc.). If we don't in the winter, then we can't use them in the winter, but they are still there for us to use the rest of the year. Maintenance was the biggest argument Administration brought forward on this. Not good enough for me. You don't maintain the ditches out here properly - we (residents) do, so I don't expect a lot of maintenance from you on the trails either anyway - we will. Also if the developer adds them now (and there is only limited options for where they can be put - MR, PUL, ER, ROW), so why not save some tax dollars and have the developer put them in and then when the Master Plan comes around in 5-10 years, we can patch them up if even required.

As you can see I am a little frustrated and I think the reason for all of this is the change of the lot size for multi parcel subdivisions in CR from 1.0 ac to 2.0 ac minimum. If that would have been the same as originally designed there wouldn't even be a need to redistrict. I know we

need more density, but not by compromising safety to persons.

My request in order to keep some control over the subdivision application in the future is to redistrict to Direct Control instead of CRE. This way we (residents) can work with Council on how this land is being developed rather than only Administration comparing any new application against compliance with the LUB.

Thank you very much for your time.

Regards  
Birgit Shaw

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jessica Harnden](#)  
**Cc:** [Kristina Kowalski](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaw 2022-13 - Land use Bylaw Amendment, Lot 2, Block 1, Plan 982 0548 and Lot 1, Plan 962 4168  
**Date:** August 19, 2022 2:48:42 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Parkland County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize this sender and know the contents are safe.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to explain my displeasure with the appeal of the Land use Bylaw amendment for these 2 parcels of land. This was already brought to a conclusion earlier this year in front of the council, and denied. Now in appeal it is a waste of resources, landowners and councils time.

As explained the first time regarding the re-zoning of this land, the infrastructure is not set up to handle this added strain. Our roadways and drainage systems are already taxed and we are not even up to capacity on lots already approved. ( 2 Acre lots ). The parcel of land in question if approved would more than double the population of the area, thus way over exerting our existing infrastructure. For the majority of Royal springs estates residents the water table is already high. Most residents already have trouble getting overland water insurance for their existing property. By adding more hardscape and residence to an area that is already inundated, us residents fear it will divert water shed towards our existing properties and away from the new development.

As far as the roadway is concerned, we already see An overabundant amount of traffic on a light duty country road. The entrance to township 532 from highway 60 is constantly backlogged due to heavy truck traffic from the transport canada weight scale. Not to mention the added strain of this traffic using 532a as a bypass road to their destination. By adding more residents, it becomes harder to access our own homes for existing residents as well as emergency and civil services. Not to mention the toll taken on the road itself.

My wife and I chose royal springs estates to get away from the congestion of city living. The abundant green space behind our home brought abundant birds and wildlife into the area. With further development of the area the animals and birds are getting pushed further and further away. We always held the understanding that one day the land behind us would be developed. We just never figured anyone would try to sway the council to fill our backyard with an abundance of homes. We believe all residences should be held to the same standard we were held to when we built our home.

When it comes time to vote we hope for this educated council to reach the same conclusion as before.... Denied !!

Sincerely,  
Concerned Royal springs resident...

*The contents of this message and any attachment(s) are confidential, proprietary to the City of Edmonton, and are intended only for the addressed recipient. If you have received this in error, please disregard the contents, inform the sender of the misdirection, and remove it from your system. The copying, dissemination, or distribution of this*

*message, if misdirected, is strictly prohibited.*