

APPENDIX D

From: [William Huckstep](#)
To: [Scott Purich](#)
Subject: Bylaw No. 1832 IDP Opposition
Date: February 23, 2023 4:17:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Scott,

I am writing to voice my concerns over the subject matter. As a MD resident immediately adjacent to the recently annexed Cold Lake city limits on Hwy 55, I am concerned this will have a detrimental effect on my property. The map attached to the notice depicts my property as "Country Residential" in the "Future Growth Area" and I hope it is to remain so. My main concern is that we will become surrounded by semi-rural developments.

I plan to attend the public hearing on 28 Feb hoping to receive more information and answers.

Thank you for your time.

--

William Huckstep



From: [Cathy Urlacher](#)
To: [Scott Purich](#)
Subject: Bylaw No. 1832 proposal concerns
Date: February 27, 2023 11:43:05 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Scott

Further to our conversation of this morning

These are the concerns we have regarding this proposal :

- 1 - We are classified as industrial on the map and should be agricultural [REDACTED]
- 2- We are located in the IDP adjoining the Future Growth area. Our concern regarding the development of this area is that such development could result in even more land loss than has already occurred. We have lost approximately 10-15 acres already due to development to the North and South of us. The subdivision and road construction have both disrupted the natural drainage of the land. This drainage used to flow from the west to the south and then continued through the subdivision to the south of us. The construction of this subdivision blocked this natural drainage, backing it up onto our land and resulting in a huge growth of willows and saturated land along the fence line which prevents farming. The paving of 423 built up the ditches compounded this drainage problem, losing us more land on the east side. Plan objective 2.3-6 is Preserve and protect agricultural lands in the IDP area. Last year the MD did a complete upgrade to the drainage to the Country Lane subdivision south of us but did nothing to improve the drainage on our property or contact us regarding it. We have called various people with no result. It is hard enough for small farms to survive these days without 'progress' like this shrinking our useable land every year. We would like the opportunity to discuss these issues further when possible.

Photos attached from Spring 2022 to show some of the areas that we were previously able to farm but now can't. I have a file of photos from 2007 to show the difference but didn't include it as it is a large file and we were told that the MD would have these aerial photos available.

Thank you

James and Cathy Urlacher

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows



















From: [DunRite Roofing](#)
To: [Scott Purich](#); [REDACTED]; dmcrae@islenengineering.com; [Planning](#); [DunRite Roofing](#)
Subject: Bylaw No. 1832 Cold Lake/MD Intermunicipal Development Plan
Date: February 27, 2023 7:05:44 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom it may concern

First I would like to express my displeasure with how this Revised draft of the IDP has been brought forward on such short notice .

We all were on a family vacation and Kyle was only able to forward me the January 23rd. draft on the 21st. of February, I am working remotely till April.

The last Draft I received was early 2021 and included map 3 which showed only a buffer around the old Cold lake dump. I still have property near that location but it is of no concern to me now that my subdivision is long sold off. It showed nothing around the old Grand Center Dump and I assumed there was no reason for concern so when the Sept meeting was held I was extremely busy and chose not to attend.

I will write out my concerns and objections in point form to shorten this email.

item a - Buffer zone revision slipped in at the last minute , it feels like this was done deliberately. If you are going to install a buffer zone (as drawn) you must include all four sides of the landfill Quarter and the original GC dump on top of Brady Heights.

item b - I was always told the landfill was restricted to a corner parcel and the city is obligated to stay within its bounds.

Are you now planning on taking up the whole quarter now ?

Item c - As far as setbacks go , wells have always been measured from the DOMESTIC garbage landfill area itself which is well documented and any Buffer Zone would have to be done the same , not from the property line.

item d - If there is such a huge concern with contamination of all the wells in the affected area the IDP must include interim monitoring of the wells and a time frame for the City to run a water line up RR 624 to service the affected residences to prevent future lawsuits as per 1.2 ,a.v of the IDP

Item e - Reference 1.2,a iii the IPD must include installation of a passing lane heading out of town at the intersection of RR624 most people are illegally using the west turning lane as the passing lane and is a disaster waiting to happen. The people that abide by the law and wait behind the cars turning left is the worst problem, they get tired of waiting and turn out in front of people using the turning lane. The speed zone should get moved south of RR 624 . no one is following the current recommended 70k sign and going through the intersection at 100 K + .

item f - ref: 2.6.2 - Delete[(no residential development) on all existing acreage that have always intended to be used as such (example) Lot [REDACTED] Blk [REDACTED] Plan [REDACTED] was purchased in the early 80's for my retirement home.

Plus someone will surely want to add an addition, garage , outbuilding ,etc. on their existing acreages.

Item g - maintain Country Residential status on all lots currently designated that way or the

IDP must include total buyout or compensation for loss of value caused by the implication of the IDP .

Item h - ref: 1.2,b (specifically) We have had a talk with the MD last summer on splitting four five acre parcels off quarter section [REDACTED] which would have already been done but we have been waiting for Land Titles to transfer the property from A Luger Holdings Ltd. to K Luger developments Ltd. for months now , they are 6 months behind.
Two of the parcels are pre sold and we intend to develop before freeze up in 2023.

item i - ref: 2.8.1 (A) delete any reference to no further development above 4 lots.
We have a future overlay plan that includes a legal central access to the rest of the Quarter, that includes city water but sewage would be handled by the current 5 acre min. Lot requirements. and should be addressed in the IDP.

note: This property is full of rocks and the terrain is only suitable for grazing at the best.

Item j - ref: 1.2,b -Develop an RF Policy and frequently monitor and document the Radiofrequency to ensure Compliance.

I have asked for this policy in the past and was told that none exists , all cities must comply.

note: The 2 towers should never have been built so close our property line , especially without any notification , permits , etc.

At the time of the second tower installation I asked the town why they were putting a new power line in and I was told the power line that ran from the dump was inadequate for the existing tower. The next thing I know is they are standing up an even larger one so close to our property that if some RF Activist should cut the cable it would fall on our property. (it has happened)

I have reached out to Ackroyd LLP and require an extended period of time for consultation and reserve the right to add or delete items as required.

We await your Response and insist these issues be resolved as per 2.13.1 g,(ii) of the IDP.

Best Regards

Al , Kyle & Cody Luger

|