

From: Connor brogden [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2026 4:04 PM
To: Appeals
Subject: 26D 201 Appeal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern,

Name of applicant/ file number

Trevor Liskowich and Sharon Spooner, 26D 201

The appeal board hearing is scheduled for Tuesday September 15 at 2:00 pm.

My name is- Connor J Brogden
[REDACTED]

Dear Subdivision and Development Appeal Board,

I am writing to express our opposition to the approval of Development Permit Application 26D 201.

Our concerns relate to the scale of the proposed building, the nature of its intended use, and the potential impact on the surrounding rural residential neighbourhood.

The proposed building is 3,024 square feet, which is substantially larger than the accessory-building allowance. Given the significant variance being requested, we respectfully ask the Board to carefully consider whether the size of the building is appropriate and whether the variance was properly authorized under the applicable Land Use Bylaw.

We want to be clear that our appeal is specifically regarding the proposed new 3,024-square-foot dog-training facility. We are not appealing or seeking to challenge the existing attached garage or its construction through this appeal. Our concern is the approval of the proposed new and substantially larger facility and the use that it would enable.

We are also concerned with the description of the proposed use as a "personal indoor dog training" facility. The property is currently being used for a multi-dog training program involving dogs beyond the owners' personal household dogs. We have observed dogs arriving and leaving the property in vehicles, indicating that this activity already involves dogs and visitors coming to and from the property.

Our concern is that constructing a 3,024-square-foot dedicated facility could allow this existing activity to expand significantly. We do not want to see a quiet residential property gradually transition into a larger-scale dog-training operation involving increased numbers of dogs, clients, vehicles, and visitors.

This is particularly concerning because our road is currently a quiet rural residential road with relatively little traffic. An increase in visitors and vehicle activity, along with potential barking, noise and odours, could materially change the character and peacefulness of the area. We also question how the County would be able to monitor the frequency and intensity of the use once the facility is operating.

We respectfully ask the Board to determine whether the proposed use has been appropriately classified, particularly given the existing multi-dog training activity at the residence. If dogs belonging to clients or members of the public are being brought onto the property, we believe the applicable land-use and kennel requirements should be carefully reviewed.

We also ask the Board to consider whether the proposal complies with the Ranchers Hill Area Structure Plan and any applicable restrictive covenant, including any restrictions relating to dogs, structures, or permitted uses.

While we understand that there may be questions regarding other structures on the property, those matters are not the subject of our appeal. Our objection is specifically to the proposed new dog-training facility and the potential expansion of the activity that could result from it.

We are not opposed to our neighbours having dogs or using their property for normal residential purposes. Our concern is with the potential expansion of an existing multi-dog training activity through the construction of a very large dedicated facility, and the resulting impact this could have on neighbouring properties and the rural character of our area.

We respectfully request that the Board carefully review the development permit, including the size of the proposed building, the variance, the classification and intensity of the proposed use, compliance with the Area Structure Plan and restrictive covenant, and the potential impacts on neighbouring properties.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask that the Development Permit for the proposed new facility be refused or appropriately modified if the proposed development cannot comply with the applicable requirements or adequately address its impacts on the surrounding properties.

Also in the Development Permit Decision there is a sentence that states “ this application proposes one accessory building for personal indoor dog training with a size of +/- 3024 sq. ft. And having a height up to 28 feet.

On a Country Residential District property between 2.0 and 2.99 acres in size, permanent dwellings are permitted up to three (3) accessory buildings with a cumulative size of up to 1,675 sq. ft. at a maximum height of 35 feet. Up to two (2) garages are permitted with a cumulative size of 1,200 sq. ft. This application proposes one Accessory Building for personal indoor dog training with a size of +/- 3024 sq. ft. and having a height up to 28 ft. The property also contains a 1372 sq. ft. garage attached to the primary dwelling.

But, if you look at the link below it clearly shows that the applicant runs a disc dog club out of his home already.

Foothills, AB, CA – June 16th – Foothills
Flyers Disc Dog Club
updogchallenge.com



Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns.

Sincerely,
Connor & Julia Brogden

WRITTEN SUBMISSION

From: Bev Brogden [REDACTED]
Sent: September 13, 2026 4:29 PM
To: Appeals
Subject: Fwd: Letter to appeal Trevor's building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Attention: Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

My husband John and I are writing to express our concerns regarding Development Permit Application 26D 201 and the proposed construction of a new 3,024-square-foot building intended for dog training.

Having been among the first settlers in this subdivision and having lived here for many years, we value the quiet, rural residential nature of the area. We believe that any new development should be carefully considered in terms of how it may affect neighbouring properties and the character of the subdivision as a whole.

One concern is the size and proposed use of the new building. At approximately 3,024 square feet, the proposed structure is significantly larger than what would ordinarily be permitted as an accessory building. We believe the substantial variance being requested deserves careful consideration, particularly in relation to whether a building of this scale is appropriate for the property and consistent with the applicable Land Use Bylaw.

We are also concerned about the activity that the proposed building could facilitate. Although the application describes the use as a personal indoor dog-training facility, there is currently a multi-dog training activity taking place at the residence. We have observed dogs being brought to and from the property by vehicles, which leads us to question whether the activity is strictly personal in nature or already involves dogs belonging to people outside the household. There is a two dog limit per acreage owner in this subdivision and we have noticed many more than two dogs - therefore they would be visiting and/or training etc. not what we would consider ordinary residential activities. We are concerned that approving a large, purpose-built facility could provide the ability for the existing activity to grow into a much larger operation. Trevor is currently involved in the Foothills Flyers Disc Dog Club which we believe he hosts at his residence, our concern with a building of this size is that the club would be using this as a commercial setting and we believe this is not the right setting for this type of facility. Again this would result in more dogs on the property, increased vehicle movements, additional visitors, and greater levels of barking and other noise. These impacts may be particularly noticeable on a rural residential road where traffic is currently limited and the surroundings are generally quiet and peaceful.

We believe the Board should consider not only how the proposed building is described on the application, but also the practical use that the building could accommodate once constructed. It is

important that the approval clearly establish what type and intensity of activity is actually permitted and that the County be able to reasonably monitor and enforce those limitations.

We also respectfully ask that the Board review whether the proposed development and use are consistent with the Ranchers Hill Area Structure Plan, the applicable Land Use Bylaw, and any restrictive covenant affecting the property. In particular, we believe any provisions relating to dogs, kennels, structures, and non-residential or commercial-type activities should be carefully considered before approval is granted.

To be clear, our objection is directed specifically at the proposed new 3,024-square-foot facility and the potential expansion of the dog-training activity associated with it. We are not seeking to have the existing attached garage or any other previously constructed structure addressed through this appeal.

We understand that properties and their uses can change over time. However, we believe it is important to consider the cumulative effect that a larger-scale dog-training operation could have on neighbouring residents and the rural character that attracted people to this subdivision in the first place. We are concerned about establishing a precedent where an activity that may currently appear limited can expand substantially through the construction of a dedicated commercial-scale facility.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Board give careful consideration to the size of the proposed building, the significant variance requested, the actual nature and intensity of the proposed dog-training use, and the potential effects on neighbouring properties.

We respectfully ask that the Development Permit be refused, or that appropriate restrictions or modifications be imposed if the proposed development cannot be demonstrated to comply with the applicable planning requirements and adequately protect the surrounding rural residential properties.

Thank you kindly for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Beverley and John Brogden

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] This email has originated from outside of the Foothills County organization. Do not click on any links or open any attachments unless you recognize the senders Name and Email address.