



TOWN OF CANMORE
RECORD OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
Special Meeting

Council Chamber at the Canmore Civic Centre, 902 – 7 Avenue
Tuesday, February 28, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

This document contains the written submissions received in response to the notice of public hearing for the following bylaw:

Land Use Bylaw Amendment 2022-27 Staircase Lands

Submissions are sorted in alphabetical order. If you are viewing the electronic version, please use the bookmarks feature to scroll through the document.

This record of written submissions was compiled by Allyssa Rygersberg, Deputy Municipal Clerk, February 28, 2023.

From: [Caroline Cousins-Mackie](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Subject: Bylaw 2022-27 Land Use Bylaw Amendment, Staircase Lands
Date: February 24, 2023 8:54:54 AM

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

Dear Mayor and Town Council,

I am disappointed to hear that we, the Town of Canmore, were not able to purchase the Staircase Lands owned by TSMV. I do not know the details of the offer or why TSMV refused it, but this would have been the ideal solution to preserve this recreational land for future generations. It provides a beautiful buffer between developments and one of our core recreational areas - Quarry Lake.

We moved to Canmore in 1995 purchasing a home in the Homesteads, the first development project of the original Three Sisters company. The area across from us has always been a wonderful peaceful area to go for a walk, a bike ride and provide access to Quarry Lake. During our time in Canmore we have seen the town triple in size and population heading towards being five times larger than what it was. When we hit full build out of Silvertip, Spring Creek and Three Sister Mountain Village and break the 30,000 residents it will be key to have recreational areas throughout the community. If we give this up or lose it now, it is gone forever.

I have always known TSMV has owned this side of the valley all the way to Deadman's Flats and will eventually build it out, but I do not support re-zoning Natural Park District lands. There was a reason it was zoned this way in the first place. TSMV has plenty of land to develop. Please prevent this rezoning.

Sincerely,

Caroline Cousins-Mackie



From: [Janine Giese-Davis](#)
To: [Shared.MunicipalClerk](#)
Cc: [Janine Giese-Davis](#)
Subject: staircase lands
Date: February 23, 2023 2:23:00 PM

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

I am writing to say that I am strongly opposed to the development of the staircase lands and request that the town do everything that they can to purchase the lands.

Development would bring light pollution and encroachment into areas of town where animals and humans transit. While not an official wildlife corridor, it is easy to see how important these lands are to animals crossing through Canmore. Recent research documents that even the elk population is down in Banff National Park likely due to increasing difficulties of elk transiting and birthing in Canmore. Clearly bears are at a breaking point according to the latest research here in conjunction with Y2Y also documenting that Canmore's development is breaking down transit areas that are crucial for Bears.

We cannot continue to compromise the parts of town that are crucial to animal transit and safety just because they are not in the "official wildlife corridors".

I continue to seek conversations with town council about the possibility of private/municipal partnerships to protect lands within town.

There are many wealthy citizens who live here and who visit here who are interested in helping to preserve in perpetuity natural areas that are crucial to everyone's experience of what makes this a wonderful place.

A friend of mine, Sheila Lodge, who was the longest sitting mayor of Santa Barbara, California, has written a book documenting processes that the town council, the planning commission, and others engaged in over decades to protect the natural areas for everyone's long-term enjoyment. This involved partnering with private citizens and foundations to purchase lands. I am not sure why we are not pursuing this here.

I have 3 extra books to give out from her (she is a long-time visitor here and to Lake O'Hara).

I tried to broker a meeting early last summer between the mayor and some of those people to discuss this idea.

It is because of Santa Barbara's private/municipal partnerships that all of us who visit can see the ocean without the obstruction of hotels blocking access.

From my perspective, everything should be pursued, and the council would do well to not only consider what they would be willing to pay, but who might be engaged to provide any additional monies to make sure this land is preserved.

These things are possible and it would be a shame to let these areas go just because the town thought that they had to do this all on their own or give up to development.

It is not either/or.

Come talk to me!

Janine

Janine Giese-Davis, Ph.D.

Adjunct Associate Professor, Division of Psychosocial Oncology, Department of Oncology, Faculty of Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine (retired)

Adj. Associate Professor, Department of Psychology University of Calgary (retired)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Website: www.Giese-Davis.com

Alberta Health Services Cancer Care -- Holy Cross Site Department of

Psychosocial Resources

2202 2nd Street SW

Calgary, Alberta

Canada

T2S 3C1

Hello,

Re **Bylaw 2022-27 Land Use Bylaw Amendment, Staircase Lands...**

Please KEEP this land zoned as it is as a "Natural Park district".

Thank you and kindest regards,
Leslie Haring



January 5, 2023

Canmore Town Clerk
Town of Canmore
902 7 Avenue
Canmore, AB
T1W 3K1

RE: Feb 28, 2023 Public Hearing for Bylaw 2022-27 - Land Use Bylaw Amendment – Staircase Lands”

Mayor Krausert and Members of Council,

This letter is to confirm that Three Sisters Mountain Village Properties Ltd. supports the subject land use amendment application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J. Karpat".

Jessica Karpat, MEDES, RPP, MCIP
Director, Planning & Community Liaison
Three Sisters Mountain Village Properties Ltd.
Pronoun: she / her / hers
Phone: 587.316.6030
Mobile: 403.819.0222
eMail: jkarpat@tsmv.ca
Web: www.tsmv.ca

THREE SISTERS MOUNTAIN VILLAGE PROPERTIES LTD.
1401 Hastings Crescent SE
Calgary, AB, T2G 4C8
403-243-1239

This email is in opposition to Bylaw 2022-27, the Land Use Bylaw Amendment of the so-called Staircase Lands. I have attached a photo of Gerry Stephenson's undermining map in the locality of the Staircase Lands for your reference. And perhaps to remind you.

I'm a retired geologist, and Gerry Stephenson showed me his maps when I asked about undermining in the Homestead neighbourhood where I live. He gave me permission to take the pictures. This map shows abundant historical coal mining activity where the Staircase Lands are located, on trend with recent undermining mitigation work that occurred a few years ago under the Spray Road near the intersection with Three Sisters Drive. This work was likely in the millions of dollars. This should be a reminder of any Town lands becoming liable for such.

When you walk through these lands, it's pretty obvious that there are shafts, and or adits that have partially collapsed, or continue to collapse. Some are fenced off. Clearly this is a dangerous place to think about housing construction. Or for the Town to own any more roads or built up infrastructure over mined areas.

I'm also not aware of how much the town offered as a buyout of these lands. Three Sisters Corp was paying next to nothing in taxes on it. I would like to know what the offer was, and why there was no effort to determine what a fair market value is for something that should be left as a wildlife corridor. Perhaps private funds can be raised to satisfy Three Sisters Corp.

Regards,

Duane Kohut



RECENT MITIGATION WORKINGS (2020?)

STAIRCASE LANDS

QUARRY BLAKE

HOME STEAD

Photo of G. Stephenson's undermining map

PEAKS OF GRASS!

From: jeff laidlaw

Sent: February 25, 2023 10:05 AM

To: Council <council@canmore.ca>; Sally Caudill <sally.caudill@canmore.ca>; Planning <Planning@canmore.ca>

Cc: Kay & Gary Anderson

Subject: By-law 2022-27

I am writing in opposition to by-law 2022-27 redesignating the "upper triangle of the staircase lands" to Future Development District.

As I recall the Court of King's Bench decision it essentially was EITHER

I) re-designate the land OR

II) Expropriate the land

A declined offer to purchase is NOT Expropriation, and can hardly be considered the rationale to choose the alternative to Expropriation.

In a broader scope, the lands in question are NOT appropriate, and frankly should never be considered appropriate, for any sort of development. The wildlife considerations should provide adequate reason to deny development BUT failing that the heavy and very obvious undermining and collapse of lands throughout the parcel are equally concerning.

I realize there is a legal quandary to consider, but THIS is NOT (in my view) the correct / appropriate response to protecting the interests of the Town of Canmore.

Thank you for your attention to this short note.

Regards

Jeff Laidlaw

Dear Councillors and Mayor :

I am writing to you to ask some questions and provide my feedback regarding the proposed Land Use bylaw amendment 2022-27 Staircase Lands.

My feedback first:

I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to Bylaw 2022-27. land Use Bylaw Amendment Staircase lands , specifically the proposed change from the current land zoned as "Natural Park " NP to "Future Development District."

My reasons:

1. The land is not suitable for development: risky and dangerous due to extensive undermining and various environmental problems including amongst others :boggy wet conditions and sinkholes . I was a participant of the late Gerry Stephenson's geological and history tours and recall the extensive map he shared which clearly indicated the underground mined tunnels near Quarry Lake . The staircase lands in question for rezoning to Future Development are undermined .

2. I am a property owner in nearby Homesteads neighbourhood, and with my geologist husband we took keen interest in learning about the Quarry and surrounding areas.

My husband assisted digging and building mountain bike trails (CAMBA member) on nearby Town of Canmore land and can attest to the sink holes on "staircase land ". These lands should remain as a Natural Park as they not only provide a natural park access to Quarry Lake , they provide wildlife habitat, they provide mtn bike trails in a natural park and they are not suitable for buildings or development.

3. The land is currently publicly labelled and warned as " Dangerous Conditions " .

As a taxpayer and concerned citizen, I do NOT want to be civically, morally or environmentally responsible for Future Developments built upon "DANGEROUS CONDITIONS " as sign warning  by TSMV land owner

Note the sign by the land owner posted on this property :



My questions to you as Council ;

As per Court of Kings Bench ruling choices ; acquire or rezone the land.

1. Will you direct Town of Canmore to commence proceedings to acquire the lands in question (portion of staircases lands designated NP)? And despite initial decline to accept the Town's offer to purchase , will you continue to pursue purchase ?

2. Will you pursue ALL options to help the Town of Canmore acquire the land?
(Have you exhausted every possible option to have Town of Canmore acquire this land?really ?)

3. Are you voting on behalf of the entire community of Canmore citizens when you vote on this bylaw amendment and if yes, do you feel you have heard and received sufficient feedback to represent all our community ?

(7 days notice in local newspaper is short time for public feedback)

5. Has the Town of Canmore considered ALL options to acquire this land? Including public notice and public consultation with sufficient time for potential fund raising ?

6. What is the definition for " Future Development District ?"

7. What development might be permitted or restricted on Lands described by current landowner as “ Dangerous Conditions “?

8. Is this “public feedback” opportunity regarding the Public Hearing Tues Feb 28 2023 actually an opportunity to influence Council decision or is the decision to amend the bylaw a forgone decision as determined by Alberta Court of Kings Bench order?

IN Conclusion ;

I am opposed to Bylaw 2022-27 Land Use Amendment: changing (this land as described)zoning from Natural Park to Future Development District.

I am also sincerely concerned about the Public Feedback Process for this particular Public Hearing : does my feedback have any effect or not ? If not, I am sincerely worried, concerned and frustrated at the entire process .

I would appreciate any reply you can provide me to any or all of my questions and concerns.

My email and phone number are provided below for your convenience.

Thank you for asking for and receiving my feedback .

Sincerely , an engaged citizen of this amazing community of Canmore of which I am proud to be a small business owner and call home .

Carol Poland DVM MSc

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposal to amend this land to a designation of "future development". It is hard to think of a more unsuitable use for this land than building of any kind. I urge Town to explore all avenues that lead to the protection of this land from development of any kind.

Many Thanks

Graeme Williams
Canmore