

ATTACHMENT 2 - Written submissions – Bylaw 2014-29 Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan

Below is a list of written submissions received in regards to Bylaw 2014-29, the Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan.

Received: November 12, 2014 - Via: e-mail, letter



SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

MAILING ADDRESS:
5TH FLOOR,
10250 - 101 STREET NW
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T5J 3P4

November 12, 2014

Reference No.: 58604240-055

Mr. Martin Frigo
Senior Planner - Long Range
Parkland County
53109A HWY 779
Parkland County AB T7Z 1R1

Dear Mr. Frigo:

Thank you for your referral of the draft Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan which proposes to guide development within the Acheson area for the next 20 to 30 years. The City of Edmonton appreciates having worked with the County throughout the planning process in an effort to address past concerns we have had with the Plan.

The City has reviewed the most recent version of the Plan, dated September 2014, and we have no objections as proposed. Please review comments from the Transportation Services Department, attached.

We look forward to continue to have discussions with the County, in particular, through joint planning initiatives as indicated in the proposed Area Structure Plan to address any potential planning issues and long-term capital improvements required along our municipal boundaries.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this application. If you have any questions, please contact _____, Intermunicipal Planner, by phone at 780-

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Paul Hanlan", written over a faint circular stamp.

c. Paul Hanlan

Attachment



TRANSPORTATION
SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

November 6, 2014

File No.: DR – 1090
Your POSSE #: 58604240-055

TO: NAME REMOVED

FROM: NAME REMOVED

SUBJECT: Draft Acheson Industrial ASP (September 2014 - Version 5)
Parkland County

Transportation Services has reviewed the *Draft Acheson Industrial ASP (September 2014 – Version 5)* and acknowledges the revisions incorporated based on the comments provided on October 2012.

Further to the above, Transportation Services has no additional comments. Should you require any additional information please contact

NAME REMOVED

FS/

cc: NAME REMOVED

From:

Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 1:52 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Cc: Paul Hanlan

Subject: RE: Requested meeting - Parkland County and Ag area A landowner reps (2)

Hi Martin,

Thanks for continuing to update us on the public process regarding Acheson.

From your email, it sounds as though the primary issue is around the proposed change in the zoning for the lands in Ag Area A – from AGG to AGR. I think that from our perspective, moving toward the AGR designation gives us a higher level of comfort regarding the type of development that might occur in that area, which is why you have identified land adjacent to Spruce Grove with the AGR zoning. However, in this instance the difference between the two districts does not concern us in a substantial way.

That is, the AGG district has 5 additional uses compared to the AGR – Abbatoir, Aquaculture, Home Based Business (3), Livestock Auction Mart and Utility Services Major Infrastructure. In addition, the AGG district has restrictions on the amount of subdivision that can take place on a quarter section.

Presuming that the County will continue to pursue and enforce restrictions around the Wagner recharge area, the City does not object to maintaining the status quo around zoning and leave the parcels that area already zoned AGG as they are.

I'm not sure that you require our assistance in pushing forward the need for sustainable development policies in regard to the Wagner Natural Area, since we all seem to be on the same page in that regard. If I can provide you with any additional information, please let me know.

NAME REMOVED

City of Spruce Grove | 315 Jespersen Avenue | Spruce Grove, AB | T7X 3E8

www.sprucegrove.org

Received December 4, 2014 – via fax

FROM :

Dec. 4 2014 3:03PM P1

TO; MARTIN FRIGO
SENIOR PLANNER, PARKLAND

December 4, 2014

FAX # 780 968 - 8444

FROM; NAME REMOVED

Fax

THREE PAGES INCLUDING COVER.

WAGNER NATURAL AREA SOCIETY

26519 HWY 16

SPRUCE GROVE AB T7X 3L4

November 25, 2014

Martin Frigo,
Senior Planner, Long Range.
Parkland County
53109A HWY 779
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1

Dear Martin:

RE: AASP 2014.

As a Society we have been involved over many years in all the changes and attempts to draft a viable plan for the industrialization of the south east area of Parkland County. All along we have pleaded for the protection of the Wagner Natural Area, an area which even the County has acknowledged as being in a Conservation area and worthy of being protected. At the same time the County has expanded the industrial boundary to include the critical Recharge Area and in effect potentially cut off the Natural Area from its underground water sources and wildlife migration routes.

These latest changes to the AASP boundaries concern us, not in the immediate future but down the road, for when someone looks at the map and says why can I not have my business located on Atim Road? It is within the AASP boundary! Because the hydrogeological costs of ascertaining the viability of the Wagner Natural Area's water supply are so great, that this step will be excused as being a hardship and the project is OK'd. That would cut off future and existing pedestrian and wildlife corridors and condemning the island fen to a lingering death. Not a good scene.

Already we see the residential enclave of Osborne Acres being taken over by newer residents who are operating so called home businesses that are larger than those the can be classified as garage type. Once classified as a residential home business there appears to be no restrictions on the modification of the type of business that can be run out of the supposed garage. This is what we fear will happen all around Wagner.

The proposed changes to the Bylaws are only as good as their enforcement and original planning. There is no mention of having the services of a highly qualified environmental planner involved in future early development planning stages so that mistakes are kept to a minimum. This use of

Page 2.

the services of such an environmental planner could also apply to the whole of Parkland County, not just the AASP.

Again referring to Wagner, to keep it from becoming a dying island in the middle of a concrete jungle, future plans must include firm plans for access to the outside lands for the free passage of wildlife and incidentally pedestrians.

According to the Administration Report for the latest edition of the AASP, growth in the area designated for Industry has far exceeded expectations so we do not have much time left to get things right and ensure that the Natural Area does not become another casualty to so called progress and the 5,000 year old ecological history of Wagner is lost for ever. The U of A, NAIT, Schools, and the general public, would regret that loss as much as the Society would regret losing its 35 year history of research, care, an enjoyment of the unique area.

Trusting that the County, through the services of yourself and other planning staff, will continue to keep the special requirements of the Wagner Natural Area front and centre.

Yours sincerely,

A. A.

NAME REMOVED

Received – December 5th / 2014



Stantec Consulting Ltd.

10160 - 112 Street, Edmonton AB T5K 2L6

December 4, 2014

File: 1161 103820

Attention: Paul Hanlan

Parkland County
53109A Hwy 779
Parkland County, AB
T7Z 1R1

Dear Mr. Hanlan,

Reference: Amendment to Bylaw 2014-28 - Municipal Development Plan and Bylaw 2014-29 Acheson Area Structure Plan – Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd.

Stantec Consulting Ltd., on behalf of Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd., is requesting to be heard at the Public Hearing scheduled for December 16, 2014. We are requesting that the Municipal Development Plan and the Acheson Area Structure Plan be amended whereby Alberta Spruce Industries Ltd., legally described as Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 942 0960, be exempt for the provision of municipal services in the event Alberta Spruce Industries expands its operation or is redeveloped for another use acting in compliance with General Industrial Manufacturing / Processing as prescribed by Land Use Bylaw 20-2009.

The background material, the reason(s) for the amendment and the proposed text amendment for the Municipal Development Plan and Acheson Area Structure Plan is included in the attachment.

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Attachment: Planning Report

c. NAMES REMOVED

Design with community in mind



December 4, 2014
Attention
Page 2 of 2

Reference: Reference

In document2

1. BACKGROUND

- ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD (ASI). IS A SPECIALTY WOOD PRODUCTS MANUFACTURER AND MARKETER AND IS LOCATED .8 KM WEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF HIGHWAY 60 ON SECONDARY HIGHWAY 628
- ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. WAS INCORPORATED IN 1987 AND HAS BEEN OPERATING IN THE ACHESON INDUSTRIAL PARK ON THE SAME SITE SINCE 1993.
- AT THAT TIME, ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. WAS IN A DIRECT CONTROL AREA AND ZONED INDUSTRIAL COMMERCIAL EXPANSION (ICE) WHEREBY ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. WAS A PERMITTED USE WITH AN APPROVED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
- IN 2013, ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. ENGAGED STANTEC CONSULTING LTD. TO PREPARE A PLANNING REPORT OUTLINING ITS FUTURE USE OPPORTUNITIES
- IT WAS DETERMINED THAT ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. WAS A “NON-CONFORMING” USE ACCORDING TO THE LAND USE BYLAW 20-2009
- THE REVISED DESIGNATION AS A “NON-CONFORMING” USE HAS SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIPS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FUTURE OPERATION OF ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD AND THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE.
- STANTEC CONSULTING LTD. REVIEWED PREVIOUS PARKLAND COUNTY LAND USE BYLAWS THAT WERE IN EFFECT SINCE 1993 AND THE ACHESON INDUSTRIAL AREA STRUCTURE PLAN (1997) RECONFIRMING THAT THE STATUS OF ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. COMPLIED WITH THE PLANNING LEGISLATION UP TO 2009
- STANTEC CONSULTING LTD. CONCLUDED THAT UNBEKNOWNST TO ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD., THE STATUS OF ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. CHANGED FROM A PERMITTED USE TO A “NON-CONFORMING” USE WHEN LAND USE 20-2009 WAS PASSED BY PARKLAND COUNTY
- TO CORRECT THIS SITUATION A REZONING APPLICATION WAS SUBMITTED TO PARKLAND COUNTY TO DESIGNATE ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD AS A PERMITTED USE



- ON JANUARY 14, 2014, PARKLAND COUNTY APPROVED BYLAW 2013-26 TO AMEND SECTION 7.6(2) BY ALLOWING GENERAL INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURING /PROCESSING ON LOT 2 AND LOT 3, PLAN 942 0960 AS A PERMITTED USE (ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD)

2. REASON(S) FOR AMENDMENT TO BYLAW 2014-28 - MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BYLAW 2014-29 - THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN

- ALTHOUGH ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD PROPERTY RIGHTS WAS REINSTATED AS A PERMITTED USE IN JANUARY 2014, REDEVELOPMENT AND /OR EXPANSION OF THE ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD REMAINED CONDITIONAL SUBJECT TO COMPLYING WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PARKLAND COUNTY MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN
- THE PLANS REQUIRE THAT ALL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN BE SERVICED BY MUNICIPAL SERVICES (WATER AND SANITARY)
- ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD IS APPROXIMATELY 3.25 KM (2 MI) FROM THE EXISTING MUNICIPAL SERVICES WHICH MAKES IT FINANCIALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO REDEVELOP OR EXPAND ITS BUSINESS
- ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD WAS AN APPROVED USE THAT PRECEDED THE ACHESON INDUSTRIAL AREA STRUCTURE PLAN (1997) AND IS ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE ADMINISTRATION AS AN UNIQUE SITUATION IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE PLANS POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES
- DUE TO ITS LOCATION, AS SHOWN IN FIGURE 9 AND FIGURE 10 OF THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN, THE PROVISION OF MUNICIPAL SERVICES CREATES AN UNDUE HARDSHIP AND FINANCIAL BURDEN
- THAT SAID, ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD IS REQUESTING THAT AMENDMENTS TO THE MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN BE APPROVED BY PARKLAND COUNTY WHEREBY ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD, LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LOT 2 AND LOT 3, PLAN 9420960, IS EXEMPTED TO PROVIDE MUNICIPAL SERVICES IN THE EVENT OF THE REDEVELOPMENT OR EXPANSION OF ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD.
- TO ENSURE THAT THE INTENT OF THE POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND THE ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN ARE MET, ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LT. IS PREPARED TO PROVIDE A LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING THAT WHEN MUNICIPAL SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE TO THE SITE, ALBERTA SPRUCE INDUSTRIES LTD. WILL CONNECT TO THOSE SERVICES AND COMPLY WITH THE OFF-SITE LEVY BYLAW

3. PROPOSED MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

That MDP Amendment 2014-28 be amended:

1. By adding the following **text in bold** to the MDP Amendment Bylaw 2014-28:
3. That Section 10 – Transportation and Utilities of Bylaw No. 37-2007, be amended by adding the following policy:

(a) Policy 10.21 Municipal Servicing of Acheson Industrial Area The County requires all commercial and industrial developments in Acheson to be fully serviced by municipal (water and sanitary) servicing, and will recover the cost of extending the systems through an offsite levy bylaw.

Notwithstanding the above, onsite servicing for future industrial and commercial developments shall be permitted on Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 only.

And renumbering the subsequent policies accordingly.

5. That Map 2 Land Use Concept Map of Bylaw No. 37-2007, be amended by:
 - (a) The "Proposed Outer Ring Road" road alignment identified in Map 2 - Land Use Concept Map, will also be removed based on the current direction provided by Alberta Transportation.
 - (b) A 200m by 800m strip of land on the west side of NW-29-52-26-W4thM will be redesignated from Fringe to Agriculture.
 - (c) All that portion of SE&SW 6-53-26-W4thM that lies south of the railroad and north of Provincial Highway 16A and NE&NW 31-52-26-W4thM excepting thereout Lot 4 Plan 167MC will be redesignated from Agriculture to Industrial/Commercial.
 - (d) Portions of SEC 32-52-26-W4thM, SW 33-52-26-W4thM, NW&NE 28-52-26-W4thM and NW&NE 29-52-26-W4thM will be redesignated from Fringe to Industrial/Commercial.
 - (e) **Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 will be redesignated from Fringe to Industrial/Commercial.**
2. That Schedule 'A' to Bylaw 2014-28 be amended to reflect the above.

4. PROPOSED ACHESON AREA STRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT

That Acheson ASP Bylaw 2014-29 be amended:

1. By adding the following in **text in bold** to the ASP Bylaw 2014-29:

6.1.1.3. *Ensure that all future development in the ASP area is fully serviced **as defined within the policies of this Area Structure Plan.***

6.1.2.2 *Direct serviced, light industrial development that requires high-visibility from major roadways to areas designated Business Industrial Area in Figure 6 – Land Use Concept. Appropriate Business Industrial uses are uses which require provincial highway or major roadway visibility, and are characterized by having higher quality building and site design standards, and higher landscaping standards. Business Industrial uses have nuisances contained inside the building envelope.*

*Typical uses in Business Industrial Areas include manufacturing, research, and testing facilities, processing facilities, and logistics and distribution centres. **Notwithstanding the above, onsite servicing for future industrial and commercial developments shall be permitted on Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 only.***

6.1.2.21 *Require all parcels that are districted for industrial or commercial uses under the Land Use Bylaw to be serviced by water, sewer and shallow utilities. The County will not support subdivision, redistricting or development which does not provide full municipal site servicing. All site servicing shall comply with adopted engineering standards and good engineering practices.*

Notwithstanding the above, onsite servicing for future industrial and commercial developments shall be permitted on Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 only.

6.3.1.2. *Ensure the full servicing of all industrial and commercial sites in Acheson through the orderly and effective extension of servicing infrastructure **as defined within the policies of this Area Structure Plan.***

6.3.2.3 *Require all parcels in the ASP area that are districted for industrial and commercial uses under the Land Use Bylaw to be serviced by full municipal water, sewer, and shallow utility servicing.*

Notwithstanding the above, onsite servicing for future industrial and commercial developments shall be permitted on Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 only.

2. That Figure 15-Development Staging be amended by redesignating Lot 2 and Lot 3, Plan 9420960 from the parcel Base to S1-immediate Development (0-24months).

CAPITAL REGION PARKLAND WATER SERVICES COMMISSION

315 Jespersen Avenue
Spruce Grove, AB T7X 3E8

Phone: (780) 962-2611
Fax: (780) 962-2526

December 3, 2014

Pat Vincent, CAO
Parkland County
53109A Highway 779
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1

Dear Mr. Vincent:

Re: Acheson Area Structure Plan ("ASP")

During the Capital Region Parkland Water Services Commission ("CRPWSC") Board meeting held on November 26, 2014, the following motion was passed:

presented information on the Acheson ASP and requested that a letter be submitted to Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain and the City of Spruce Grove indicating that the Commission has the ability to service the Acheson ASP provided that necessary upgrades to the Parkland County system are completed as contemplated by the ASP draft report.

Moved by Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk to accept the information as presented and to send a letter to Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain and the City of Spruce Grove.

Carried."

The CRPWSC is satisfied that the Acheson industrial area, outlined in the proposed Acheson ASP can be adequately serviced with water. The information provided within the plan demonstrates that water servicing has been carefully considered, and that any growth of industrial uses placing a higher demand on the water supply will result in the necessary upgrading, to be completed by Parkland County. The commission has no outstanding concerns regarding this proposed ASP."

Should you require any further information, please feel free to contact me at

Yours truly,



December 5, 2014

Parkland County

Planning

Martin Frigo

Senior Planner Long Range Planning

Dear Martin

We are writing to you with respect to the Acheson Area Structure Plan which is currently being amended

Our concern is with the closing of Bevington Rd. from or onto Highway 16A. When Bevington road access was closed at highway 16 Yellow Head it had a dramatic effect on our business but we could somewhat accept the reasoning. It was because Highway 16 Yellow Head was to be the express Highway with limited access for safety. But Highway 16A was to remain the service route ensuring access along the way. This is what we were told. Now it seems if we are reading this correctly they are saying that 16A is to become an express route and the access for Bevington Rd. will be closed. In looking at the area Map #12 there are some Proposed Interchanges that could be an alternate route for our customers should Bevington rd. be closed, but these are only proposed and our experience is that they will be years away from becoming reality if ever. We don't understand the logic in limiting the access to a major industrial area such as this given that there is already an express highway in use 3 kms to the north. Closing the Bevington rd. access will only put more traffic on to Highway 60 which is already over capacity. We know there are proposed upgrades for Highway 60 but when if ever. It is frustrating to us that we are trying to do business in this area and have supported the local Acheson economy since 1983 and now we are going to be cut off from the main flow of traffic, for what reason? To make it easier for people get into Edmonton to spend their money? We understand that with progress and growth comes change but we are of the firm stand that the Bevington rd. access should remain open until all the proposed upgrades are completed.

Received December 8, 2014

To the Parkland County Council,

We, the Osborne Acres Residential Association would like to thank you for the hard work of you and your staff in continuing to develop the Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan. Many of the residents within our Association attended the Open House that took place on November 6, 2014, and had a chance to speak with the planners involved in the development of the ASP. After taking some time to review the ASP we have compiled a list of comments that we would like to relay to you. The comments found below represent the opinions of the Association, which includes the vast majority of residents living within the Osborne Acres subdivision.

Firstly, we have noticed that the County plans to develop a network of trails throughout the Acheson Industrial area, which we believe to be a very good idea, as it would promote safe exercise and transportation options for employees working within the Industrial subdivision. Current use of roadways for walking is not safe, and walkers often do not make way for cars during the day. We suggest that this network should be developed throughout the Industrial areas, near the doorsteps of the businesses, which will encourage actual use, and not within MRs that the County owns. One method to ensure this takes place is for the engineering departments to implement a standard road right of way cross-section that includes a 2.5m Shared-Use-Path beside the road. This would mean that the developer would be installing the trail network as they develop throughout the area, and would not cost the County any capital. Maintenance of the pathway system would be significantly more cost-effective, as accessibility to the trails with heavy equipment would be greatly improved. Potential incidental damage to the natural landscape around the trails would be reduced as well. In addition, the residents of Osborne Acres would not need to be concerned with increased access to their properties, as the trails would be located on the other side of the berm from our properties. In the end this proposal would benefit the Acheson Business Association, the County and Osborne Acres equally.

There is also a section in the ASP which speaks towards a new recreational facility located in the MR just east of our subdivision. In the ASP it is stated that this facility would be of great benefit to the residents of Osborne Acres. This is not the case, since our local road would see massive increases in traffic. For many years we have enjoyed a peaceful roadway that our children can use to bike to the neighbours. This has changed over time, as the industrial development north of the railway has increased—Many industrial and commuting vehicles are using our road to access Spruce Grove and west much quicker than using HWY 60 and 16A during the regular bottlenecking periods, as well as when convenient to them during the day. It is worth noting that there are currently signs on each end of the subdivision indicating the fact that only local traffic is allowed on that road. A police officer has been out checking compliance to the signage and found it was very poor. If a recreational facility is introduced to the one end of our subdivision we are convinced that even more traffic from Spruce Grove will use our local road to access it. The estimates of traffic increases we have are very concerning to us. We strongly encourage the county to consider not developing this area into a recreational facility. It is of no benefit to us, will actually have very negative implications on our way of life, and will only benefit those who live in Spruce Grove or Stony Plain. Most

definitely we believe that the wording in the ASP should change to more accurately reflect the lack of benefit this facility will hold for our subdivision.

We notice in the most recent version of the ASP the 200m buffer surrounding our subdivision has received a change in nomenclature, as it is now called an industrial use setback, as opposed to a buffer. It has been called a buffer for a very long time, and this change is concerning to us. We heard at the Open House that such a change results in the County being more able to develop within this area, even if it won't be industrial. The comment in the [Oct 31 Parkland Communicator by the Hon Mayor Shaigec](#), also gives us reason to be concerned. He states with reference to the revision of the MDP, and LUB's, "These bylaws identify the types of development or actions that can occur in different areas or districts within the municipality and can be identified as permitted or discretionary uses. While discretionary uses can be contentious, they provide flexibility so development is not prohibitively restricted – it provides flexibility for unique situations. " As this buffer has existed in ASPs since as long ago as 1997, we are very concerned with this apparent last minute change. We do see hope in the next paragraph, where he continues, "The intent and desire of Council is to have favourable land use for the public at large without infringing on the rights of individuals." We respectfully ask that you continue to use the wording you have always used with respect to this area, and continue to limit the development potential of this space to protect us and our families.

In the ASP there is reference to potential future water and sanitation servicing to the Osborne Acres Residential Area, although it appears from the figures in the appendices that not all of the residential subdivision is considered, as the sanitation line is shown to stop just past Morgan Creek. We are interested to know if the full residential subdivision (including those homes on RR 265) would be included in the servicing, or if there is a reason that such development would not be feasible. Additionally, the ASP refers to cost-sharing agreements for any work that would have to be completed for water and waste water installations. Could the County please provide clarification as to how this would be structured?

Regarding 6.9.2.1 in the section labelled Agriculture, it reads that development south and west of Wagner Natural Area will be allowed, if the sensitivity and natural characteristics of the lands are respected. We believe this is quite vague and open for interpretation, and would request that the Planning department consider developing structured standards and guidelines for this area, similar to the Acheson Overlay requirements in the MDP.

An additional concern we hold relates to the storm water controls that need to be put in place to manage the incredible growth of the industrial areas around us. The creeks in our area continue to erode, and further development in the agricultural land just to the south of us will only accelerate the erosion. We believe that it is extremely important to consider the installation of storm retention infrastructure within the buffer/industrial setback directly to the south of our residential subdivision. Similar to the sanitation lines, the ASP refers to cost-sharing to help pay for such initiatives, and again, we are interested in what form this would take. Considering the increased flow through the creeks is directly attributable to the industrial developments to the south of us, we assume that the burden of such cost-sharing initiatives would be placed upon the industrial developers. We would like clarification of this point from the County.

Items such as the Acheson Overlay requirements in the MDP are a strong indication of the County's willingness to maintain our way of life and allow us to continue to live in the peaceful and tranquil

environment that we have always lived in. We are concerned, however, that there appears to be a significant disconnect between the long term planning of the County and the actual implementation of those plans. There are numerous developments nearby our subdivision within the Overlay that have yet to meet the constraints indicated in the MDP. These developments have been in place for over 8 years, and yet they have not met the requirements for berms, fencing and landscaping that are placed in the MDP. It leaves us very nervous with a new development most likely being installed directly south of our properties. Will the County begin enforcing the rules that they have put forward? Does the County need to increase the amount of money they are holding back from developers to ensure these requirements are met?

Finally, we would like to take this opportunity to thank the County for the hard work that has been put into planning this ASP and others, and the amount of effort you have expended to ensure all affected stakeholders have the opportunity to get involved in the process.

On behalf of the Osborne Acres Residents Association,

NAME REMOVED