

A. Brent Saklofske



May 14, 2026

To: Stacey Kotlar
Planning and Development Officer
Foothills County
309 Macleod Trail, Box 5605
High River, Alberta T1V 1M7

RE: PROPOSED SITE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT

Legal Description of Subject Parcel: Ptn. NE 07-22-01 W5M

Dear Stacey,

Let me begin my stating that the proposed amendments regarding this property will directly and adversely effect myself and every property owner on our 85th Street cul-de-sac. The peace and quiet we all enjoy, which are the necessary prerequisites for a Rural Residential setting, will be destroyed.

These are my many concerns regarding this proposal.

- 1) Proximity. The placement of all structures, access road and outdoor areas will be intrusive in a number of different ways.
- 2) My privacy and quality of life will be constantly and directly compromised in multiple different aspects.
- 3) Noise from traffic, activities and the odors from, specifically, manure, will be invasive.
- 4) Light bleed from outdoor lighting will be invasive. All residents on this cul-de-sac are sensitive and respectful of each others quiet and 'dark sky' quality.
- 5) Traffic will take a Rural Residential setting and transform it into an industrial setting with guests, clients, maintenance vehicles, farriers, horse trailers, manure trucks etc. This proposed access road is to the immediate south of my property line making a constant flow of vehicles. Noise, exhaust pollution and amount of traffic will be excessive.

- 6) The proposed pond will compromise our water table.
- 7) Our views of the west including foothills, mountains and sunsets will be partially and in many cases, completely obliterated.
- 8) The natural beauty that we all enjoy will be turned into an industrial appearance, an eyesore. Family, friends, visitors and other neighbors from properties close by but not on 85th Street, enjoy the solace we enjoy and respect as residents. We are a community with total respect for each other's quality of life.
- 9) Our health, mental and physical will be directly compromised by such a development. Happiness is a key to good mental and physical health. Air quality will be compromised with animal waste and vehicle exhaust. All of the above points will be detrimental to our over-all health and well-being.

The over-sized and over-height aspect of the main arena is all wrong with the architectural integrity of our residential homes. These are our homes, our lives.

I do use plural, 'we' and 'us' a lot because we are all friends in a community that we respect individually and are respectful of each other. This proposal is not conducive nor respectful in any way to the setting on 85th Street.

Thank you for reading and considering my words.

Sincerely,

A. Brent Saklofske

Foothills County
Box 5605 High River AB
T1V 1M7

May 24th, 2026

Attn: Foothills County Council Members

**Re: Council Meeting May 27th
Item C.3
Sinneave Estate/Wood NE07-22-01 W5M - Site Specific Amendment**

Dear Members of Council and the Planning Department -

I am Earl Mennie, submitting my personal insights as an adjacent landowner due east of the property identified in the Application/File # 26R 018, for a site specific amendment to your bylaws for the construction of a new equestrian structure and development.

I note this application is guided by the professional office of TPD Inc and the application is relatively detailed in the description of the proposed development of accessory structures, their approximate positions, fencing and even the addition of a fire suppression pond. This description is appreciated in understanding the scope of **the private and not commercial intentions** of the landowner within the current rules of development in the County and proximity to the City of Calgary.

As illustrated in the submitted diagrams and satellite overlays, a new East/West approach to 85th street is proposed - creating two access points to Block 7; which in my opinion makes this application process to also consider the future of the undeveloped lot 4 of Block 6, (southeast of the proposed building site) and how this affects additional easements on each. I suggest that direct access to 210 Avenue would be more appropriate and in this case the consideration of a new 1/3 of a mile north south municipal road with a cul de sac (or hammerhead) access to 210 Ave to serve future, approved development further west. Again - we trust that Council takes both the current proposal and how it may affect future development in the whole quarter section.

I and my family are in agreement that this development requires our County and Council to take a detailed assessment of this special amendment request, as requested in the February 2026 application. We trust that the Planning department has taken all aspects into consideration in advising Council on this issue. If they follow all requirements and conditions requested by Council, I am favor of this proposal for a private, not a commercial - equestrian operation.

We appreciate this equestrian use in the application does merge with the country residential environment that we and our neighbors enjoy in close proximity to the city. Proper grazing practices of the native grassland of our shared southern slope does also include efforts for wildfire prevention to protect all residences on this section.

I do note one letter of concern submitted to this application on May 14th, and I believe some of those items of concern should be carefully addressed by the Applicant as steered by Council and the Planning Department:

Traffic will likely be limited for the care and attention of a few horses. **Light trespass** (bright security lighting affecting the dark skies - as suggested) likely would be minimal with properly placed - designed outdoor lighting. **Engineered design of the (plastic lined I assume) pond** should initially catch spring runoff and not affect the water table.

Residing in an originally agriculturally based area that now supports growing equestrian activities does come with occasional farrier and possible manure transport; or the traditional treatment of said organic material to the soil with traditional agricultural practices (harrowing). I expect professional design of the large and small structures will be both in compliance and in the equestrian esthetic of the area as guided by our Planning Department, and not be industrial in appearance. My prior suggestion to Council to consider a new North/South municipal road to serve my fellow western neighbors with proper access to 210 Avenue and hence would definitely address the growing traffic concerns on 85th Street West.

Since there is no View Assessment process in this County to deal with the expressed view concerns to the west - I encourage new dialogue between all affected neighbors and the Planning Department on the location of the proposed structure.

I do specifically note other neighbors that do not share our equestrian appreciation, have allowed the overuse of loud "dirt bike/gas powered motorcycles nearby" - including the development of a off-road track in the original grass and treed environment near 80th street - which in my opinion affects the peace and quiet of the area and all residents along 85th Street West and others.

I and my family have had extensive development application experience with Foothills County with specific hard lessons learned with our own past applications; as due diligence is required when making a land purchase in this area...including what may be possible if concerned about a residents' future view.

Jim and Marion Sinneave were very helpful in the initial development of 85th Street West 25 years ago, with our mutual land donation and shared financial support of the design and construction of a municipal road. This cooperative effort benefitted our families and later on, facilitated additional new lots approved by Foothills County. This created the opportunity for other families to experience the special country living environment of 85th Street West, which included the growth in the value of their properties.

This is the personal opinion of myself, my wife Alice and my family. We are willing to hear other opinions of residents of this area who would be affected by this development application and the site specific amendment that it is asking Council to consider. Looking forward to the future - new development is obvious in this area, so close to a growing city, we hope the County makes equitable decisions in this application and inevitable future applications that will affect us all on this quarter section.

Sincerely,

Earl and Alice Mennie & Family

████████████████████
████████████████████

Marvin & Anita Weiss

May 22, 2026

Foothills County
Planning and Development
309 Macleod Trail, Box 5605
High River, AB T1V 1M7

RE: PROPOSED SITE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT

Legal Description of Subject Parcel: Ptn. NE 07-22-01 W5M
Public Hearing on Wed. May 27, 2026 at 1:30PM

To Whom it May Concern,

As property owners living less than 100m east of the applicant's property, we are opposed to the proposed site specific amendment for two main reasons.

Firstly, a 17,100 sq. ft. private arena structure is contextually insensitive to the existing development in the area over the past 25 years. Besides, the County has recently required the removal of a similar sized arena structure at 88101 – 206 Ave W, which is less than 700m northwest of the applicant's property and in a similar Country Residential development area. So, it makes little sense for Council to approve a similar structure to one that they have just required to be removed, presumably because it is not a suitable land use for the area. All the development in the immediate area over the past 25 years has been single family homes on acreages of 2.5 acres or larger, with no semi-commercial discretionary use development. Furthermore, the placement of such a large monolithic structure on the crest of the hill, where it substantially obstructs existing residential developments, will negatively affect land values of neighboring properties. For these reasons—as well as the water-intensive nature of indoor riding arenas—this application does not, in our opinion, conform to the spirit of the Land Use Bylaw for this area.

Secondly, the request for an easement on the adjacent lot to build another road access from 85 St W is completely unnecessary (as raised by Public Works) since the property has direct access to 210 Ave W on the north side of the applicant's property. It was also troubling to learn from the staff report that the existing access to the property across the adjacent lot has no easement registered and thus does not constitute a legal access to the existing house. So, we are opposed to Council granting an easement to allow a second access from 85 St W, as such easements should only be granted in special circumstances where they are deemed appropriate, and this is not such a circumstance, in our opinion, as there is direct access via 210 Ave W.

Thanks for your consideration of our concerns.

Respectfully,

Anita & Marvin Weiss