

Carman Sutton  
112 Pearson Bay  
Fort McMurray, AB T9H 4S1

February 18, 2020

Jade Brown, Chief Legislative Officer  
Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo  
9909 Franklin Avenue  
Fort McMurray, AB T9H 2K4

Attention: Jade Brown

RE: Public Hearing – Bylaw No. 20/002 – Lot 1, Block 1, Plan 182 1793 from R1M to R1S

This submission is provided to you in regard to the proposed rezoning of Lot 1, Block 12, Plan 182 1793 from R1M – Mixed Form Single Detached Residential District to R1S – Single Family Small Lot Residential District.

I am submitting this in **OPPOSITION** to the proposed above.

I do not support any zoning which would allow any development as a permitted use. My Home is immediately adjacent to this property and the impacts that we have already in the past suffered have been profound, not to mention the impact that any future development on this site would have on us.

9102 McPhee Street is quite unique property unlike the others in the area or in fort MacMurray. I have listed a few points.

- 1 It is roughly the same size as the entirety of Pearson Bay.
- 2 There are 8 lots on Pearson bay, 7 developed currently all zoned R1S. Ranging from around 3500<sup>2ft</sup>–4000<sup>2ft</sup>. McPhee is at least 10-12 times that.
- 3 McPhee Street is not built to current municipal standards.
- 4 There is only 1 access above and the road doesn't have proper access for residents or emergency personnel
- 5 The upper portion has a steep slope to a lower flat area.
- 6 The steep slope has previously prevented development of the lower portion.
- 7 Since the fire the current owner has purchased 108 cote bay and has joined them together.

Issues with the McPhee/Cote bay property's

Pre fire

- 1 The slope was heavily treed until the current owner cut down all trees immediately adjacent to my property and thinned out the slope excessively which caused flooding at our older residence.
- 2 The trees on the slope were further cut down prior to the fire which caused more flooding at our residence and cause even further issues and I'm sure this year will be no different.
- 3 Drainage issues from the massive upper area to the lower area into resident's back yards which causes our yards to be "soup" and not accessible for about 2-4 weeks plus in the spring.
- 4 This is considered a flood plain with no natural drainage. The trees did most of the work.

Post fire

- 5 Wood Buffalo Recovery Committee has the property identified as alluvial terrace, alluvial slope and alluvial floodplain.
- 6 Since the fire there are no trees left to absorb and precipitation from either upper, slope, or the lower section or property which has caused many issues with our rebuild.
- 7 Putting a house on the lower or several on the upper would just cause even more extensive water issues.

Pre current owner it was a beautiful greenspace out back of my property. I use to hear someone singing but never knew where or who it was. I had no idea that there was a house up on the hill because I couldn't see it. It was nothing but trees and I never had any water issues.

After the current owner moved in, they cut down all the trees behind 108 and 112 and thinned out the slope on his property behind mine on Pearson bay, that spring my back yard was unusable for about 6 weeks because of the sheer amount of water. My basement flooded for the first time ever.

I had spoken to him on a few occasions and said that this will affect me and my properties and there was total disregard for me and my property. He didn't care if I was affected by his water.

After the fire there were no trees at all and the run off from above property caused a large pool behind 112, 116, 120 Pearson bay. Also my property at 108 was also affected to a lesser degree but still affected. The back yards are inaccessible for several weeks bc of the sheer amount of water from the adjacent property.

It is my understanding that another property owner is not allowed to adversely affect another property owner in this way. I do not feel that I would be properly protected going forward from the damages this will cause, the hardship I have and will to endure if the owner of the land is allowed to do as he see fit. I believe that the city has an legal and moral obligation to its other constituents to protect them from total disregard from other neighbors.

If you take into account of all the properties on cote, Pearson bay, and McPhee and other areas that will be adversely affected by this, the city needs to have strict control of this and protect other neighbors.

The residents in these neighborhoods need to have a say regarding the rezoning, future development of the McPhee/Cote bay property. I will be bringing in photos of what was and is at the meeting for your review.

I am requesting that Council instead consider a Direct Control zoning. Direct Control zoning would require that any decision about the future development of the property be made by Council and let the affected public have a say into these matters,

I request that Council not support the proposed zoning amendment.

If you were a resident in our predicament, you'd want a say. Let us have ours.

DIRECT CONTROL zoning, not what has been proposed.

Sincerely,

Carman Sutton















































