



LAND USE BYLAW REWRITE

Cypress County

What We Heard Report Working Document

Between February 16 to March 1, 2022 members of the public were asked to provide their input on the Land Use Bylaw Rewrite. Respondents had the opportunity to use fillable/printable PDF and hard copy surveys to provide their responses back to the County. Verbatim responses from both initiatives are outlined below. In response to the feedback to the survey and open house, draft changes have been attached at the bottom of this What We Hear Report.

LUB Question #1:

Please check off the most appropriate response (Yes/No):

- » I am familiar with what a Land Use bylaw is, and what its role is in the County.
- » I have read the current Land Use Bylaw in its entirety.
- » I have read the draft Land Use Bylaw in its entirety.
- » I have read those sections of the current Land Use Bylaw that are relevant to me.
- » I have read portions of the draft Land Use Bylaw that were relevant to me.

Respondent	Feedback
1	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
2	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
3	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
4	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
5	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
6	No, No, No, Yes, Yes
7	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
8	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
9	Yes, N/A, N/A, N/A, Yes
10	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
11	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes

LUB Question #1:**Please check off the most appropriate response (Yes/No):**

- » I am familiar with what a Land Use bylaw is, and what its role is in the County.
- » I have read the current Land Use Bylaw in its entirety.
- » I have read the draft Land Use Bylaw in its entirety.
- » I have read those sections of the current Land Use Bylaw that are relevant to me.
- » I have read portions of the draft Land Use Bylaw that were relevant to me.

Respondent	Feedback
12	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
13	Yes, No, No, N/A, N/A
14	Yes, No, No, No, No
15	Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes
16	N/A, N/A, N/A, N/A, N/A
17	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
18	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
19	Yes, N/A, Yes, Yes, Yes
20	Yes, N/A, Yes, N/A, N/A
21	Yes, Yes, No, Yes, Yes
22	Yes, No, No, Yes, Yes
23	Yes, N/A, N/A, Yes, Yes
24	Yes, N/A, N/A, Yes, Yes
25	Yes, No, Yes, Yes, Yes
26	Yes, No, No, No, Yes

LUB Question #2:

What sections of the LUB are of interest to you? Why?

Respondent	Feedback
1	Keeping a 5 km radius from hamlets protected from renewable resources (wind farms).
2	<p>5.1 – Agricultural District (A1-IDP) 6.1 – Country Residential District 1 (CR-1) 6.2 – Country Residential District 2 (CR-2) 6.3 – Country Residential Multiple Unit Dwelling District 6.4 – Country Residential Limited District IDP (CRL-IDP)</p> <p>Several permitted uses have been added to each district from previous bylaw</p> <p>IDP states that the Town will eventually annex the lands to the north of Redcliff. Concern is expressed on the lands identified as commercial/industrial area in Map A of the IDP. The uses are widely varied and not all uses may be compatible for development.</p>
3	<p>Wind turbine set back limit is too close.</p> <p>Need to be at least 5 km away from Community of Dunmore.</p>
4	Wind mill set back limit to be kept min 5 km Radius from all hamlets in Cypress County
5	I am concerned with wind farms being closer than 5 km to hamlets in Cypress County. Full effects of wind turbines are unknown and I would not support them being near dense populations. I support the 5 km setback.
6	<p>Regards to Eagle Ridge + Dunmore.</p> <p>Wind turbines in close proximity</p>
7	Interested in the long term effects on what wind turbines will mean to our environment. We feel they definitely should not be closer than 5 km of the hamlet
8	The windfarms portion: because of the proximity to residence with current proposals
9	I approve the Land Use Bylaw that allows for a 5 km radius for hamlets like Dunmore in Cypress County (no wind farms or renewable resources within the 5 km radius)
10	Placement of windmills in area. Avoid the use of windmills in this area of residential.
11	I am concerned with the placement of wind farms being closer than 5 Kilometers to hamlets.
12	<p>Keeping a 5 km radius from hamlets.</p> <p>Protected from renewable resources (wind farms)</p>

LUB Question #2:

What sections of the LUB are of interest to you? Why?

Respondent	Feedback
13	Wind energy. I am <u>very</u> unhappy that there are turbines proposed 800 m from our residence. There are many health and quality of life issues that companies claim they will “mitigate”, but in reality they do no. (eg. Shadow flicker)
14	Wind energy projects are intrusive to citizens of the County through them expecting the residences to deal with the shadow flicker and noise. The County I believe should put resistance on the distance they can be build by a residence. The fact that its ok to push the distance from a hamlet is fine to help out the residence but to not treat the rural residence with the same treatment I think is unfair to people.
15	I agree with the proposed bylaw to have renewable resources at least 5 kms from hamlets (wind projects). I feel that a wind farm 2 kms from Dunmore would greatly affect property values!
16	I agree with proposed bylaw to have renewable resources (wind projects) at least 5 km. from hamlets.
17	I agree with the proposal to have renewable resources @ least 5 kms from hamlets (wind projects)
18	I agree with the proposed to have renewable resources at least 5 kms from hamlets (wind projects)
19	WEF-C 12.25 We are directly and adversely affected by WEF development
20	WEF-C 12.25 We are directly and adversely affected by WEF development
21	12.25 WEF-C I am directly and adversely affected by industrial wind energy development
22	12.25 Commercial wind energy – directly and adversely effected
23	Wind Energy Facility – commercial Sec 12.25 Directly + adversely affected by project
24	Wind energy: Commercial Sec 12:25 Facility Directly + adversely affected by the project as a whole.

LUB Question #2:

What sections of the LUB are of interest to you? Why?

Respondent	Feedback
25	<p>The sections of the LUB that are of interest to us are Section 12.11 Greenhouses, Commercial Class 1 & 2.</p> <p>In section 12.11.3 we request that the language would remain consistent with the current LUB pertaining to the 80 per cent threshold, as during shoulder seasons and certain weather conditions we need to maintain the ability to moderate the climate within the greenhouse.</p> <p>In Section 12.11.4 (b) the setbacks for greenhouses has been changed from 100m to 300m. We request that this remain at 100 m for residences, as a 300m threshold would curtail future development of our newly acquired greenhouse, and potential future greenhouse developments. With the steps we have taken to ensure that light is contained within our current operations, we feel these changes are unnecessary.</p>
26	Please see final Comments section.

LUB Question #3:

Does the new draft bylaw address your interests or specific land use issues?

Respondent	Feedback
1	Yes. Please accept the 5 km radius.
2	We have concern with the regulations relating to wind/energy/solar farms within the A1-IDP area. Annexation of future lands from the county should be taken into consideration when thought is given to wind/solar energy farms. A supporting area structure plan to the north would be beneficial for future planning in this area to further identify the impacts on the entire area from uses such as wind farm, solar and/or large commercial or industrial development.
3	N/A
4	N/A
5	N/A
6	Unknown. Just amended. “wind energy facility, small scale + commercial reviewed and enacted” “WEF now a specific use regulation”
7	Yes in some ways.
8	The windmill farms will be too close to residences and the value of property decreasing. The other effects that go along with wind chop.
9	Yes
10	Specific land use. Keep area for residential families & not bring in windmills in areas that may benefit future families or other types of use such as farm.
11	N/A
12	Yes, 5 km radius.
13	If 3 km is a buffer zone for hamlets, it also should be for <u>all</u> residences. Clearly, there are negative impacts to living in proximity, the # of people complaining shouldn't mean its ok to make a smaller # of people suffer the consequences.
14	N/A
15	N/A
16	N/A

LUB Question #3:

Does the new draft bylaw address your interests or specific land use issues?

Respondent	Feedback
17	N/A
18	N/A
19	It does not sufficiently address specific land use issues. The removal of the Wind Energy Area Overlay District significantly impacts the adjacent landowners ability to contribute to the development application process. Removal of the WEA Overlay removes the requirement for a public hearing on the development application. As these WEF-C developments will fundamentally change the community and the landscape, a public hearing is undeniably necessary. The process is already stacked against the adjacent landowner or county resident who is opposed to the project, and this removal further advances approval in favour of the developer.
20	<p>It does not take into consideration the interests of landowners who are not in favour of turbines but whose homes and land holders are affected by them.</p> <p>Setbacks should be from the property line not from a dwelling.</p> <p>Removal of the Wind Energy Area Overlay impacts the landowners ability for their input in the development process as it removes the requirement for public input.</p> <p>The whole process for acquiring land and installing the WEF is already stacked against the landowner.</p> <p>With no input from these landowners the process is much smoother for the developer to get approval.</p>
21	Removal of the wind energy overlay district removes the requirement for a public hearing for a development which fundamentally changes the character + nature of the community + the landscape. Removal of W.E.O.D. fast tracks the approval in favour of the developer in a process which is already stacked against the local landowner who is opposed to the development.
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of the wind energy overlay removes the public hearing • The setback from rural residences is insufficient • No resident of this county should have to endure shadow flicker from a turbine.
23	<p>No.</p> <p>Setback from single residence insufficient.</p> <p>Decommissioning not mentioned.</p> <p>Sight lines, flashing lights on towers</p> <p>Removal of wind energy overlay removes requirement for public hearing</p>

LUB Question #3:

Does the new draft bylaw address your interests or specific land use issues?

Respondent	Feedback
24	Insufficiently addressing setbacks Decommissioning not addressed: County tax payers on the hook? Sight lines, noise excess traffic The new bylaw removes public say/disapproval Give the developer too much sway over public discourse
25	We understand the desire to ensure there is a balance between any new greenhouse development and residential quality of life, however a setback of 300m would curtail economic development and signals that the County is not open to greenhouse expansion and development. We also feel that this does not take into consideration that, over and above what is required, we are installing ceiling blackout curtains on all of our legacy ranges that do not currently have them (finalized fall 2022), which will almost completely eliminate any residual light.
26	Please see final comments section.

Question #4:

Based on your property or your adjoining neighbour's property, what do you think might be missing in relation to uses or regulations in the new Land Use Bylaw?

Respondent	Feedback
1	Keep the 5 km boundary
2	N/A
3	N/A
4	N/A
5	N/A
6	N/A
7	N/A
8	Certain that neighbours are opposed to it
9	N/A
10	N/A
11	N/A
12	Keeping a 5 km radius of renewable resources
13	N/A
14	N/A
15	N/A
16	N/A
17	N/A
18	N/A

Question #4:

Based on your property or your adjoining neighbour's property, what do you think might be missing in relation to uses or regulations in the new Land Use Bylaw?

Respondent	Feedback
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinstatement of the Wind Energy Overlay District to ensure due process - Future repairs/Maintenance of roads in the WEF area is not ensured. As the bylaw reads now, the security is released back to the developer upon completion of construction. However in the future when the WEF is in operation, there will be situations where a tower or blade will need to be replaced and roads will once again need to be altered to accommodate the traffic. There is no provision for this situation. The security should be held for the life of the facility rather than until the initial construction is completed. - Setbacks from tower/turbines/infrastructure should read "from non participating landowners property line" rather than "from the nearest dwelling." If this is not changed it will adversely impact the adjacent landowner from any additional development on their land. Often family members wish to live nearby aging parents and thus choose to build homes in the same area/property to continue farming/ranching operation – this may be limited with the bylaw wording as it reads in the current draft. <p>The bylaw fails completely at addressing decommissioning of the WEF-C. Security should be provided by the developer (amount based on the projected costs at present time and these costs reviewed on a regular basis to ensure funding allocations are kept in line with actual costs to decommission) and held by the County for EACH tower/turbine/substation etc. of the WEF until such time as the WEF has been deemed to be at end of life. These funds will then ensure that the funding is available to complete decommissioning at the time that it is needed. I refer to the issue of "orphan wells" and the costs to decommission that is now being placed at the feet of the government. Costs to decommission WEF is already in the billions for small facilities at today's prices.</p>
20	<p>Reinstatement of the Wind Energy Overlay District to ensure due process. There should be a requirement for funds to be set aside in trust, which are increased as costs increase, for the disposal of the turbines and other facilities once they are no longer viable. Cypress County residents, especially those opposed to these "green energy" options, should not be held responsible through their taxes to dispose of them. We see how our taxes could already be impacted significantly by oil & gas companies who have walked away from their wells etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can clearly see how the oil and gas companies have received money from the government for decommissioning orphan wells and have not, in some cases, used the money for that purpose. There needs to be clear and concise guidelines in the decommissioning process.
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setbacks should be from property line of non participating landowner. • LUB fails to address cumulative effects. • Road security should be held for life of project

Question #4:

Based on your property or your adjoining neighbour's property, what do you think might be missing in relation to uses or regulations in the new Land Use Bylaw?

Respondent	Feedback
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe there should be an increase of setback to reduce impact on rural residences. A non-participating landowner should not have to endure hardship from the wind projects. The county should apply the same bylaw as forty mile county with the red light being controlled by radar. The removal of public consultation by removing the wind project overlay I fear will remove the public from knowing about future projects.
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road maintenance after construction complete when companies still accessing turbine sites – should continue to be responsibility of wind company Lights on turbines – impact of flashing lights Shadow flicker managed properly by companies Setback from property line not residence <p>Bylaw should address cumulative affects of all projects</p>
24	<p>Road maintenance during lifetime of the facility. Who pays? Company should be liable for the lifetime of the project.</p> <p>Lights on the top of turbines.</p> <p>Setback from property line not actual property</p> <p>Cumulative affect from all the facility should be taken into account not just per turbine.</p>
25	<p>Our recently acquired greenhouse was purchased with the goal of expanding the facility. If the draft bylaw passes and the 300m setback is applied we would need to apply for a variance in order to expand our operations. This would delay our expansion and would curtail our ability to grow our business. We would ask that either this property be grandfathered in with the current development setbacks or the new draft bylaw be written with the current 100m setback.</p>
26	<p>Please see final comments section</p>

LUB Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

Respondent	Feedback
1	N/A
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule C is missing. Without maps it is difficult to comment on the districts and how the impact Redcliff. 2. 11.15.4 – A Landfill Map would be useful to ensure the boundaries described are shown appropriately. The Redcliff Regional Waste Management Facility is adjacent to undeveloped land (land which will be used for future Landfill expansion but if a development occurs in the wrong location due to setback discrepancies that land may no longer be available for expansion). 3. 11.11.1 – exterior lighting illumination shall be contained within the site – is this greenhouse related or driven by another source? 4. Discretionary Class 2 is defined under Discretionary Use, Class II. The same wording should be used throughout the document. 5. The use of a table (4.4) to summarize permitted/discretionary uses is a great tool, however the colouring makes it difficult to read. 6. The use of various colours throughout the document is visually appealing, however some colors are difficult to read. The light grey text is also challenging to read, especially when printed. 7. Appreciated the detail in the definitions sections.
3	N/A
4	N/A
5	N/A
6	5 km min for any large wind projects from any hamlet.
7	N/A
8	Would like to see the turbines further away from residences and much further away from the hamlets of cypress county
9	N/A
10	<p>It's important to make sure that we use this area for resources that will benefit us</p> <p>Not windmills with flashing lights,</p> <p>Eliminate lots of Birds in area</p> <p>Land in area drops in value as no one wants to build by a windmill – unreal</p> <p>Disappointed</p>

LUB Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

11	N/A
12	N/A
13	N/A
14	N/A
15	N/A
16	N/A
17	N/A
18	N/A
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County provided only the minimum notice to resident's regarding the LUB review. With many resident's without internet to view the County website, and as the article in the Cypress Courier published Feb 23, 2022 online and presumably same in print (which many will not receive until a few days after print, at best) many did not receive notice at all un the Review dates of Feb 24 & Feb 25 had already passed. This short notice results in an incomplete sampling of resident's feedback on the LUB changes. *SUGGEST THAT THERE BE A MINIMUM 2 WEEK PUBLISHED/MAILED OUT/EMAILED NOTICE PROVIDED TO RESIDENTS ON ANY PROPOSED BYLAW OR DEVELOPMENT CHANGES TO ENSURE STAKEHOLDERS CAN SATISFACTORILY CONTRIBUTE* <p>The County also has the ability to broadcast messages to residents through the Municipal ALL-net platform, this system appears to be under-utilized by Cypress County. Many other municipalities successfully use the All-Net Connect system to broadcast many types of alerts to residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *When I called the office to find out more about this review, I asked how notice is typically provided; County website, Cypress Courier, and Facebook were the answers given to this question. Many people choose not to be on Social Media, and to rely on Notices posted on Facebook really is not a suitable form of providing Notice.
20	Not sufficient notice was provided for awareness of the review dates. There are many options available to get information out to residents. People are pulled in so many directions in their daily lives these days we should not be expected to add looking on a County or Newspaper website daily/weekly. Farmers/Ranchers or Country Residential residents do not go to the sites to retrieve their mail daily.
21	<p>The LUB fails to address removal/decommissioning of the turbines.</p> <p>There was insufficient notice given to address the changes to the LUB</p>

LUB Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did the county want to increase the setback on hamlets and subdivisions but not considering increasing the setback on rural residences more that you have set in the new land use bylaw? • It fails to address the decommissioning and removal of towers to hold the company liable. • Public was not given adequate time to review the Draft due to poor advertisement to make the public aware.
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative environmental impact • Migratory path – impact on bird population • Poor notice regarding proposed changes • Not everyone is on facebook or gets papers in time to be aware of proposed changes
24	<p>Time to make comment on this bylaw was tight at best.</p> <p>Fails to address decommissioning.</p>
25	<p>We want to work with the County and find that balance between supporting economic development and also ensuring that residents enjoy quality of life. We fully support ensuring that greenhouse operators do all they can to mitigate illumination coming from their facilities and not impacting their neighbours. We've taken proactive steps to make sure that our facilities will have full light blocking curtains installed so as to be good neighbours. We feel that if greenhouse facilities have ensured that curtains are installed to suppress light illumination from going beyond their parcel then the 300m set back is unnecessary and strikes the balance that the County is trying to achieve.</p> <p>We thank you for your time in meeting with us on February 25th and are available for further discussions if needed.</p>

Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

26

Dear County,

Thanks for opening up the draft Land Use Bylaw to comment by property owners.

My main concern is Re the commercial wind developments that are increasing on our beautiful, horizontal Prairie landscape--and my specific concern is Re Section 12:25. There needs to be practical procedures for both residents and Council to affect these developments. The power, no pun intended, of these industrial developments in both financial and political clout, both Provincially and Federally, is disproportionate with the democratic power of residents and Council. This ain't right!

Therefore I suggest Council amend the Bylaw to include town-hall meetings, petitions Re commercial wind development, and to list specific, significant powers of Council after such feed-back from residents, powers basically to show who's boss Re commercial wind development in Cypress County: voting residents and the Council they elect, not these powerful companies and city bureaucrats a million miles away.

Please amend the bylaw to include: 1) Public meetings and petitions property-owners can participate in Re commercial wind developments, 2) Powers of Council to tell these companies, who have no idea where they are throwing up their towers, what to do!

Specifically powers of Council to: a) Block any project or individual tower by means of votes of Council, b) Cancel any project or tower approved by the bureaucratic big-whigs at the AUC, or other Provincial or Federal big-whigs!

I am exhausted as a property owner with being practically powerless against powerful companies and clueless, elitist bureaucrats--WHO DON'T OWN PROPERTY WITHIN A MILLION MILES OF WHERE THEY DECREE THINGS TO HAPPEN! You don't see them throwing up these commercial wind developments between Calgary and the mountains that they decree for between Medicine Hat and the Cypress Hills do you? Why? Because it's "Rules for me, and rules for thee!" They are glad to decree.

Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

27	<p>RE: Cypress County Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw Review and Draft Amendments</p> <p>Dear Ms. Brown,</p> <p>I understand that Cypress County is undertaking a review of the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw and that proposed draft amendments to these documents are posted to Cypress County's website at the following location:</p> <p>http://www.cypress.ab.ca/p/project---mdp-lub-review</p> <p>I understand that the revised Municipal Development Plan was adopted in November 2021. I understand that the County is seeking stakeholder feedback on the draft Land Use Bylaw (dated Feb 4. 2022).</p> <p>I understand that the draft Land Use Bylaw uses the term "WEF-C" to refer to "Wind Energy Facilities – Commercial" and that Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use Bylaw proposed by the County says:</p> <p>"The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision or from a hamlet shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi)."</p> <p>I have land leased to the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project being development by ENGIE Development Canada LP in Cypress County. A wind project such as this would provide hundreds of millions of capital investment in Cypress County and provide significant economic benefits to Cypress County and Cypress County residents. The local benefits would include substantial property tax payments to the County, long-term annual revenue to participating landowners, large demand for local employment during construction, good long-term jobs during operations and other indirect economic benefits to local businesses like hotels and restaurants. Investments like this should be encouraged in the County.</p> <p>The 5km setback to hamlets or existing multi-parcel country residential subdivisions proposed in Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use bylaw is excessive and would have a negative impact on the timing and economics of the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project.</p> <p>I request that you remove Section 12.25.2 of the draft Municipal Development Plan or decrease the proposed setback to a maximum of 2km, as that should be more than enough.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this request.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p>
28	<p>Good day,</p> <p>The Dunmore Community Association wishes to express support for the Land Use Bylaw prohibiting wind farms from being erected within a 5km radius of hamlets in Cypress County.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

29

RE: Cypress County Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw Review and Draft Amendments

Dear Ms. Brown,

I understand that Cypress County is undertaking a review of the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw and that proposed draft amendments to these documents are posted to Cypress County's website at the following location:

<http://www.cypress.ab.ca/p/project---mdp-lub-review>

I understand that the revised Municipal Development Plan was adopted in November 2021. I understand that the County is seeking stakeholder feedback on the draft Land Use Bylaw (dated Feb 4, 2022).

I understand that the draft Land Use Bylaw uses the term "WEF-C" to refer to "Wind Energy Facilities – Commercial" and that Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use Bylaw proposed by the County says:

"The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision or from a hamlet shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi)."

I have land leased to the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project being development by ENGIE Development Canada LP in Cypress County. A wind project such as this would provide hundreds of millions of capital investment in Cypress County and provide significant economic benefits to Cypress County and Cypress County residents. The local benefits would include substantial property tax payments to the County, long-term annual revenue to participating landowners, large demand for local employment during construction, good long-term jobs during operations and other indirect economic benefits to local businesses like hotels and restaurants. Investments like this should be encouraged in the County.

The 5km setback to hamlets or existing multi-parcel country residential subdivisions proposed in Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use bylaw is excessive and would have a negative impact on the timing and economics of the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project.

I request that you remove Section 12.25.2 of the draft Municipal Development Plan or decrease the proposed setback to a maximum of 2km, as that should be more than enough.

Thank you for considering this request.

Yours Sincerely,

Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

30

RE: Cypress County Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw Review and Draft Amendments

Dear Ms. Brown,

I understand that Cypress County is undertaking a review of the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw and that proposed draft amendments to these documents are posted to Cypress County's website at the following location:

<http://www.cypress.ab.ca/p/project---mdp-lub-review>

I understand that the revised Municipal Development Plan was adopted in November 2021. I understand that the County is seeking stakeholder feedback on the draft Land Use Bylaw (dated Feb 4, 2022).

I understand that the draft Land Use Bylaw uses the term "WEF-C" to refer to "Wind Energy Facilities – Commercial" and that Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use Bylaw proposed by the County says:

"The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision or from a hamlet shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi)."

I have land leased to the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project being development by ENGIE Development Canada LP in Cypress County. A wind project such as this would provide hundreds of millions of capital investment in Cypress County and provide significant economic benefits to Cypress County and Cypress County residents. The local benefits would include substantial property tax payments to the County, long-term annual revenue to participating landowners, large demand for local employment during construction, good long-term jobs during operations and other indirect economic benefits to local businesses like hotels and restaurants. Investments like this should be encouraged in the County.

The 5km setback to hamlets or existing multi-parcel country residential subdivisions proposed in Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use bylaw is excessive and would have a negative impact on the timing and economics of the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project.

I request that you remove Section 12.25.2 of the draft Municipal Development Plan or decrease the proposed setback to a maximum of 2km, as that should be more than enough.

Thank you for considering this request.

Yours Sincerely,

Question #5:

Any other comments? We greatly appreciate your feedback!

31

RE: Cypress County Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw Review and Draft Amendments

Dear Ms. Brown,

I understand that Cypress County is undertaking a review of the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw and that proposed draft amendments to these documents are posted to Cypress County's website at the following location:

<http://www.cypress.ab.ca/p/project---mdp-lub-review>

I understand that the revised Municipal Development Plan was adopted in November 2021. I understand that the County is seeking stakeholder feedback on the draft Land Use Bylaw (dated Feb 4. 2022).

I understand that the draft Land Use Bylaw uses the term "WEF-C" to refer to "Wind Energy Facilities – Commercial" and that Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use Bylaw proposed by the County says:

"The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision or from a hamlet shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi)."

I have land leased to the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project being development by ENGIE Development Canada LP in Cypress County. A wind project such as this would provide hundreds of millions of capital investment in Cypress County and provide significant economic benefits to Cypress County and Cypress County residents. The local benefits would include substantial property tax payments to the County, long-term annual revenue to participating landowners, large demand for local employment during construction, good long-term jobs during operations and other indirect economic benefits to local businesses like hotels and restaurants. Investments like this should be encouraged in the County.

The 5km setback to hamlets or existing multi-parcel country residential subdivisions proposed in Section 12.25.2 of the draft Land Use bylaw is excessive and would have a negative impact on the timing and economics of the Buffalo Trail Wind Power Project.

I request that you remove Section 12.25.2 of the draft Municipal Development Plan or decrease the proposed setback to a maximum of 2km, as that should be more than enough.

Thank you for considering this request.

Yours Sincerely,

<p>Response to Comments</p> <p>In response to the comments received, the following changes are proposed:</p>	Draft 2 Provision	Proposed Changes to LUB
	12.25.2. The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision or from a hamlet shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi). This setback may be reduced by the Development Authority if the applicant can demonstrate that the visual impact is mitigated as a result of existing topography and vegetation, to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.	<p>(CHANGE) 12.25.2 The minimum setback for WEF-C from a from a growth hamlet defined in the Municipal Development Plan shall be 5.0 km (3.1 mi) and shall be 3.0 km (1.8 mi) from small and rural hamlets. This setback may be reduced by the Development Authority if the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Development Authority that the WEF-C will not negatively impact existing or future hamlet growth from such impacts as light flicker, noise levels, structural and blade failure, and Ice throw.</p> <p>(ADD) The minimum setback for WEF-C from a multi-parcel subdivision where the Municipal Development Plan identifies future growth shall be 3.0 km (1.8 mi). This setback may be reduced by the Development Authority if the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Development Authority that the WEF-C will not negatively impact existing or future hamlet growth from such impacts as light flicker, noise levels, structural and blade failure, and Ice throw.</p>
	12.25.3. The minimum setback for WEF-C from a dwelling unit shall be four (4) times the height of the WEF-C, as measured from the ground to the highest point of the rotor's arc.	<p>(ADD) The minimum setback for WEF-C from a dwelling unit that is located on the title property that the WEF-C is sited shall be two (2) times the height of the WEF-C, as measured from the ground to the highest point of the rotor's arc.</p> <p>(CHANGE) The minimum setback for WEF-C from a dwelling unit that is located on an adjacent, separately titled property shall be five (5) times the height of the WEF-C, as measured from the ground to the highest point of the rotor's arc.</p>
		(ADD) The minimum setback from any underlying or adjoining County utility or public right-of-way shall be one (1) blade length plus 10 m.
		(ADD) The minimum setback for WEF-C from a provincial highway shall be as required by Alberta Transportation.
		(ADD) The minimum setback for WEF-C from a provincial highway shall be as required by Alberta Transportation.

	<p>12.11.3 Outdoor lighting for the commercial greenhouse facility shall not allow illumination beyond the parcel. A commercial greenhouse class 2 facility shall require additional light shading to prevent specific lighting used for the growing of plants from illumination beyond the parcel.</p>	<p>(CHANGE) 12.11.3. Outdoor lighting for the commercial greenhouse facility shall not allow outward illumination beyond the parcel. A commercial greenhouse class 2 facility shall be required to contain 80 per cent of the artificial light from illuminating upwards and outwards at all times as a condition of the development's approval. The applicant shall be required to submit a detailed description of the artificial lighting control at the time of the development application.</p>
		<p>(CHANGE) b. A commercial greenhouse facility in the Agricultural District more than 8.0 ha (20.0 ac) in total site size, shall be located a minimum of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300.0 m (984.3 ft) from a dwelling that is located on an adjacent parcel and measured between the proposed commercial greenhouses to the exterior wall of the dwelling; • 300.0 m (984.3 ft) from a boundary of a Residential District and measured between the proposed commercial greenhouses to the boundary of the Residential District; and • 100.0 m (328.1 ft) from a dwelling located on an adjacent parcel or Residential District and measured between the proposed commercial greenhouses to the boundary of the Residential District where the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Development Authority that 80 per cent of the artificial light can be contained from illuminating upwards and outwards at all times from the commercial greenhouse.