

Patrick Steffes [REDACTED]

To: Legislative Officer; Corey-Ann Hartwick; Rod Frank

Cc: Glen Lawrence

Mon 6/13/2022 10:51 AM

Hello,

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. **The original, unedited feedback from the community engagement has not been provided to council.** The use of a consultant, paid by the developer, to create a sanitized version of the community feedback is a broken process, that creates a substantial bias for the developer. The consultant that has collected and “amalgamated” the feedback has not demonstrated that the information submitted by residents has been submitted intact for council to make a decision. The “what we heard” section is extremely biased—it does not reflect the actual tone and frustration residents submitted regarding this development, and creates the illusion that everything has been addressed by the planting of a few dozen trees.
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. Traffic studies show “minimal” traffic impact, but anyone that is trying to turn left with a blind hill to the south on Range Road 231 at 8:00 AM will have a much different opinion. Those exiting from the south understand that any vehicles exiting this proposed development make this intersection extremely challenging during high traffic conditions. 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. If there is actually an interest to solicit feedback from residents, why not inform all of the residents in the adjacent neighbourhoods, rather than those at the edge? Every residence on the south side of the Windsor Estates has an interest in this intersection and development, yet very few were actually notified.
3. **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.”** Why do we keep doing this in Strathcona County? “We know this will be a problem in the future, but someone else will take care of it.” How about “if you want to proceed with this, make the changes now. And if the development isn’t financially feasible if you need to make those changes, how about you come back to the table when it is?” This short-sighted “it will be someone else’s problem in the future” just leaves the ratepayers on the hook in the future. As we build out Strathcona County, it is up to council to steer us towards “Yes, this is great for the community, let’s do it!” I see no benefit to the community in the proposals that are before council.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick Steffes

Windsor Estates
[REDACTED]