

August 16, 2026

Re: Proposed Amendment: SW 06-20-01W5M

My name is Conor MacLean, and I am an owner of an offsetting quarter section (NE 06-20-01W5M) to the proposed amendment. In April 2026 I attended a council meeting objecting to the proposed amendment. At this meeting I sited concerns regarding proximity to our established agricultural business and concerns surrounding infringement of the natural integrity of prime agricultural property. My position is unchanged and I am objecting to the proposed application by Mr. and Mrs. Canario. My objections remain focused on:

- Agricultural fragmentation:

This is prime agricultural property and has been for over 100 years. My family has preserved and ranched it for more than 50 years. Each new subdivision poses unique threats to the sustainability of this property. New subdivisions introduced new homes and new neighbours who often deviate from the traditional values in which this agricultural business is rooted in. In April, Mr. Canario indicted that the property is poor quality based on glacial deposition. I assure to council, it is in fact, highly productive and would welcome a site tour.

- Communication and consultation:

At no point in time has Mr. or Mrs. Canario approached me to explain their proposal. I have never met Mr. or Mrs. Canario. It is a common curtesy to meet with neighbors when there is a significant proposal being presented. If Mr. or Mrs. Canario were to approach me, I would ask what research they have initiated with respect to ground water on the ridge. I have extensive experience in subsurface evaluations as a geologist with more than two decades of experience. Ground water on this ridge is a major concern. Existing neighbours to the proposed amendment have every reason to worry about ground water with the addition of two prospective dwellings. Have the Canario's hired a hydro geologist to present a risk assessment?

My objection to the proposed amendment is to request council to encourage the Canario's to revise their proposal to a better alternative. Either and outright denial to the plan or reconsider plans to develop, at most, one new parcel, downslope, adjacent to their existing dwellings. If this were to occur, the fragmentation to existing agricultural property would be minimized, and risk mitigation of ground water could be better managed.

Regards,

Conor MacLean

August 16th, 2026

Foothills County
309 Macleod Trail, Box 5605
High River, Alberta
Phone: 403-652-22341

Attn: Kristi Beunder proposed Amendment SW 06-20-01W5M

Introduction:

As a neighbor and joint owner of agricultural property located at NE 6-20-1W5, I continue to oppose the application submitted by landowners Nuno and Cherie Canario. To respect Council's time, I will not repeat the objections outlined in my original letter dated February 28th, 2026. My additional comments are provided for the following reasons:

- **Communication**

Since the original public hearing on Wednesday, March 4th, the Canario's have not contacted me, either formally or informally. To date, I have never spoken with Nuno or Cherie Canario. I would have appreciated an effort to establish communication and work together on a solution that minimizes agricultural fragmentation within Foothills County. Unfortunately, no courtesy consultation has been offered by the Canario's.

- **Subsurface**

As a Geologist and member of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) for nearly 20 years, I am concerned about the unintended consequences that further agricultural fragmentation could have on future water well development in this area. In particular, water wells located on higher ground generally have lower flow rates and may lead to additional water wells required to serve current and future occupants and livestock. While groundwater falls under the jurisdiction of the Government of Alberta, I believe the potential impacts are also germane to Foothills County. Available area data suggests that water well deliverability on higher ground, such as this parcel, is generally poorer than in lower-lying areas closer to the Sheep River. Completion lithology is important, as water production and drainage area can vary significantly depending on factors such as fractured porosity sandstone versus tighter sandstone. In my opinion, well drainage radius in this area could range from approximately 200 m to 460 m, depending on lithology, production rate, depth, and cumulative production time. Without a clear plan for the number and location of future wells, further land fragmentation may result. I would therefore like to understand the proposed plan for future water well placement and access so that surface disturbance and fragmentation can be minimized for all stakeholders in the area.

Thank you very much council for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Kyle MacLean



February 28th, 2026

**Subdivision - SW 06-20-01 W5M - 20 acres. File F2001-06SW Appeal August 18, 2026
1:00pm**

Lori Rogers [REDACTED]
Draft To: appeals@foothillscountyab.ca
Bcc: [REDACTED]

Sun, Aug 16, 2026 at 11:05 AM

To: Appeals Board Foothills County,

I am formally objecting to the proposed subdivision appeal application noted above submitted by Kristi Beunder for landowners Nino and Cherie Canario.

The 20 acre parcel of land is one property south of my family's property which we originally purchased in May 1966.

Over the last 60 years 96 Street has seen many additional small subdivisions approved, increasing road traffic on a dead-end road.

This proposal will now double the residential density on this parcel, adding more road traffic, noise, and strain on our precious water supply. Historically, drilling water wells further south of this property was abandoned and cisterns are used.

A couple of years ago my property was impacted by a fire that started on the adjacent property when a resident was starting a burn pile. This was a first for me in my 60 years. The more we increase the density along with our drier climate, the more this scenario becomes a worry.

My property as well as this proposal, borders sections of raw agricultural land to the east and across 96 Street to the west.

The country character of the area—stunning views, wildlife, and quiet—were all qualities we have enjoyed for 60 years. Adding more developments on this street only undermines this.

Many estate-style developments are available in the area on smaller parcels of land for those wishing to live there; however, fewer 20- to 80-acre parcels remain available for those who want to own livestock.

For these and other reasons I respectfully urge you to uphold your original ruling to turn down this application.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Loreen Rogers
Legal Description - NW 6;20;1 W5 N660' of S1320
Civic address - [REDACTED]
Mailing address - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]