

From: Cathy Harness

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 12:09 PM

To: Legislative Officer <LegislativeOfficer@strathcona.ca>; Corey-Ann Hartwick <Corey-Ann.Hartwick@strathcona.ca>; Rod Frank <Rod.Frank@strathcona.ca>

Subject: Bylaw 24-2022, Bylaw 25-2022, Bylaw 26-2022

I am opposed to Bylaw 24-2022, 25-2022, and 26-2022, and would like to submit this letter in opposition to these bylaws, for the public hearing on June 14, 2022.

My concerns:

1. As a concerned landowner, I have been actively involved with the public engagement process regarding the proposed Panorama Estates. **Strathcona County Council has not been provided with the original and unedited feedback from the community engagement process.** Council received a condensed version of public feedback that did not accurately reflect the numerous concerns of numerous residents. In their "What We Did" paragraphs, the developer and paid consultant successfully created illusions for Council that public concerns had been addressed in meaningful ways. The process is biased against the concerned landowners.
2. **Many residents in Windsor Estates are outside of the "notification area"** despite the fact that this development and land use change will have substantial impact to the main intersection of their neighbourhood.
3. **As a landowner exactly opposite the proposed development, I was given very few days to respond.** The developer, on the other hand has had full-time staff working on the proposal for months. This is not meaningful public engagement. The "engagement process" wasn't designed to engage the residents, it was designed to engage the smallest possible number of residents to ensure there was no friction.
4. Traffic studies show "minimal" traffic impact, but anyone that is trying to manage safe driving with the **blind hill to the south on Range Road 231** will have a very different experience.
5. **The development proposed makes no significant improvements**, and leaves critical infrastructure changes for the future development. Essentially there is an acknowledgement that road and service changes are required, but that **some other person further down the line will take care of these.** If the developer wants to proceed, the developer must be required to make the changes now. As we build out Strathcona County, it is up to Council to set and maintain the precedent of fair and just process.
6. **There is no benefit to the community in the proposals that are before council.**
7. We ask you to address the irregularities of the Public Engagement process.
- 8.
9. e) The GSA synopsis of "Feedback from Previous Engagement: What We Heard/What We Did" was condensed and word-smithed to the extent that most aspects of previous feedback were unrecognizable. I can attest that significant previous feedback was actually nowhere to be found in the proposal. Take, for instance, my own well-supported feedback that the character of Sconadale Road could not be maintained unless GSA planned a treed buffer zone both along Sconadale Road and along Range Road 231. The treed buffer became a noise attenuation wall, which does nothing whatsoever to maintain the historic character of the neighbourhood.

2. We ask you to require GSA to take financial and logistical responsibility for:

a) Traffic flow improvements to the already hazardous intersection of Range Road 231 and Sconadale Road. As GSA proposes things in ASP Section 6.3, they deftly shift the onus onto other landowners who might theoretically wish to subdivide within the ASP. If one looked carefully through the GSA documents and website, it was seen that GSA conceptualizes 129 lots within the ASP, to be developed in future development stages. Notice GSA's statements,

"At full build out of the ASP...a roundabout...should be built..."; and, "A subdivision agreement will be required for all stages...as additional development will contribute to increasing traffic and servicing demand"; and also, "Levies are required for offsite infrastructure as part of new development." Our safety at the corner of Sconadale Road and Range Road 231 is going to be impacted with any development of Subject Site Lot 8, Plan 1989 NW and road improvements to the intersection should be required of the developer at that time, not at some time in the future when the developer will have no financial responsibility in the matter.

b) A meaningful, protective wildlife corridor. One doubts that our already constrained wildlife population will get the memo to arrange their habitat to accommodate GSA's narrow plans for them.

c) Useful trail connectivity. "Outright offensive" are the only words with which one can describe the GSA proposal that "Trail Connectivity" be situated on the north side of Scondale Road. GSA aims to change our historic neighbourhood forever and yet proposes that landowners opposite the subject site take all the responsibility and make all the sacrifices for the trail? And to have the planned trail proceed directly out to Range Road 231? One is baffled that GSA thinks this somehow reaches the acceptable threshold for the county's development requirements or neighbourhood improvements.

3. We ask you to remember that the Public Service Land Use within the ASP is historic, having been zoned for this purpose since 1992.

It is highly concerning to us, and to other interested landowners with whom I have spoken, that GSA makes open allusions that it somehow is to be credited with and appreciated for the neighbourhood support and opportunities currently being provided by the leadership and members of Victory Baptist Church. The GSA website and its proposed ASP both make these allusions. As I noted above, the land owned by Victory Baptist Church has been zoned Public Service since 1992. The beautiful and charming church building that compliments the neighbourhood extremely well has been in use since the spring of 2000. This is decades of benefit to our neighbourhood, for which GSA can take no credit whatsoever.

4. GSA makes large hints that the country residential developments "adjacent" to the subject site include the Meadow Hawk subdivision. Meadow Hawk is not "adjacent" by the normal understanding of the English language.

5. The undergirding principles set out in the Municipal Development Plan and the Strathcona County Country Residential Area Concept Plan.

Leaders from county administration offices were present at previous public engagements with GSA. It is clear to me from my conversations with these individuals that the uniqueness of the Sconadale Road neighbourhood is of importance to Strathcona County. Our neighbourhood is not only unique, it is historic within the county and has intrinsic value because of its beauty, its singular serenity, its wildlife, its natural and widely undisturbed ecosystem. The quarter section through which Sconadale Road travels is not a blank slate of undeveloped land merely awaiting the permitted 129 lots. Families and homes have been here since at least 1964. Some parcels are the original 20 acres; some parcels have been subdivided, but are none smaller than 3.4 acres. The bordering neighbourhoods directly touching to the north, east, south, and west complement our neighborhood and together make this immediate area highly attractive and desirable within Strathcona County. GSA proposes 19 lots to crowd within Subject Area Lot 8, Plan 1989 NW. GSA furthermore conceptualizes that each landowner along Sconadale Road will wish to subdivide his land into crowded one-acre parcels. Given all the factors at play, this conceptualization is an assumption of monumental proportions. Proposals for one-acre lots anywhere in the Sconadale Road neighbourhood do not meet the guiding principles of either the Municipal Development Plan or the Strathcona County Country Residential Area Concept Plan.

Municipal Government Plan

a) Section 2.1 Context and Interpretation

"...plan for and manage growth in a way that preserves the unique characteristics of each municipality"

"preserve the area's agricultural heritage"

b) Section 3.1 Arts, Culture & Heritage

"Strathcona County has a rich legacy of urban and rural natural landscapes that define it"

"Strathcona County is valued for and values its natural beauty and quality of life"

c) Section 3.2 Environment

"Strathcona County will be an environmental leader and ensure responsible use of the natural landscape"

d) Section 3.3 Economic Development

"promotion of the County's unique rural/urban character"

e) Section 5.3 Country Residential Policy

"...country residential subdivisions to the east and south of the community of Sherwood Park represent a historical residential growth pattern"

"Strathcona County's objectives are to ensure the Country Residential Policy Area respects and connects natural and rural landscapes"

"...requiring the Country Residential Area Concept Plan to provide direction on...transitioning and buffering"

"Support rural living opportunities by...respect[ing] the character of the existing subdivision"

"Ensure respect for and connection of natural and rural landscapes by requiring developments to retain tree stands where the trees provide environmental features and provide biodiversity"

f) Section 7 Definitions

"Buffer means a land use, feature or space that acts as a physical separation"

"Heritage means all that is inherited from the past. It, therefore, includes the built environment...behaviours and patterns of life. A community's heritage encompasses its entire environmental inheritance."

"Heritage Resources Plan means a plan to provide...for enhanced heritage conservation initiatives that will involve and engage the broader community, including private property owners."

"Natural Landscape means clusters or complexes of multiple environmental features that lie within a particular area. Together these create the natural landscape."

"Rural Character means qualities and characteristics regarding the historic settlement pattern or rural communities which are appreciated and valued by local residents..."

Strathcona County Country Residential Area Concept Plan

a) Section 2.0 Plan Vision

"The country residential area fosters a rural residential lifestyle while respecting and conserving the natural environmental and rural landscape."

"To facilitate the development of country residential and compatible land uses that foster a rural residential lifestyle"

b) Section 3.1 Capital Region Growth Plan

"Implementing policy that would apply a uniform parcel size to the CR-ACP area in order to simply address the density requirements of the Capital Region Growth Plan would not address the many complex aspects of the existing natural and physical features of the landscape, social values or economic matters."

c) Section 3.2 MDP Plan for Country Residential Development

"...accommodate country residential development and related activities, while conserving the natural and environmental features of the lands...Natural landscape features will be maintained within the policy area with the conservation of...wildlife corridors, forming a prominent aspect of existing and future development."

d) Section 4 Plan Development

Contains several pertinent directives and principles too numerous to list in this email

e) Section 4.3 Residential Development

Objective "Accommodate country residential development..while respecting and conserving the environmental and rural landscape."

SHALL ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING

Section 4.3.1(d) Subdivision within Existing Country Residential Subdivisions *"No new parcel created will be smaller than the smallest existing parcel within a previously subdivided quarter section."*

Section 4.3.1(g) Country residential Transitioning *"any proposed parcel abutting an eisting country residential parcel two acres or greater in size has a minimum area of of two acres...and adequately mitigates the potential for both visual and noise effects to the satisfaction of the County."*

f) Additional and salient principles are found through both the MDP and the Strathcona County CRACP. These principles must be studied without bias toward or pressures from GSA.

The GSA proposal has enormous immediate and future ramifications for landowners along Sconadale Road and for the adjacent neighborhoods. Green Space Alliance is obligated to provide meaningful public engagement and we are confident that the County of Strathcona will require engagement to be both meaningful and transparent. I appreciate your attention to this feedback I am giving to you directly.

Yours sincerely,

Cathy Harness

[REDACTED]

Sherwood Park, AB

[REDACTED]