

Heather Miller

002RED

From: L B [Redacted]
Sent: May 27, 2026 12:34 PM
To: Ann Mitchell; Dev Assistant
Subject: Clarification on Notice of Public Hearing 2025 & 2026

To Chief Administrative Officer and Planning and Development,

I am writing regarding the current public hearing notice I just received for the proposed redistricting of lands from Agricultural "1" (AG1) District to Aggregate Resource Extraction & Processing (AR) District near Isle Lake (Notice of Public Hearing of Bylaw 22-2017-02-2026).

I previously attended the 2025 open house and submitted concerns regarding this application. However, following that process, no final decision, procedural update, or disposition of the application was communicated to participating residents.

As a new Council has now been elected, I respectfully request clarification regarding the procedural status of the original application before the current hearing proceeds.

Specifically, I request responses to the following:

1. What was the final disposition of the original 2025 application presented to the previous Council?
2. Did the previous Council formally approve, refuse, defer, table, or otherwise direct the application? Please provide the corresponding dates, motions, and Council resolutions.
3. Were environmental, hydrological, reclamation, traffic, drainage, or other technical studies requested by the previous Council and, if so, were all requested requirements completed and submitted to the County?
4. Is the current hearing considered:
 - o a continuation of the original application,
 - o a reconsideration of the original application,
 - o or an entirely new application?
5. What material differences exist between the original application and the current application before Council?
6. Regarding the Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) between Lac Ste. Anne County and Parkland County:
 - Was Parkland County formally circulated on the current application?
 - Were watershed, environmental, drainage, haul route, and cross-boundary impacts reviewed under applicable IDP policies?
 - Were any comments, concerns, or recommendations received from Parkland County?
 - Does Lac Ste. Anne County consider the application compliant with all applicable IDP provisions?
7. Will all previous public submissions, objections, correspondence, and hearing materials from the prior 2025 application be included in the current public hearing record for consideration by the newly elected Council?
8. Was the prior application formally closed, withdrawn, deemed inactive, or otherwise concluded before the current hearing notice was issued?
9. Where can the package presented to counsel for the first reading on May 14, 2026, be viewed?

[Date printed]

10. The current notice states that the application materials can be viewed on LSAC.ca; however, I am unable to locate either the public hearing notice or the application documents online. When will these materials be made publicly available for review?

Given the significant public interest surrounding Isle Lake, its tributaries, surrounding residential communities, and environmentally sensitive lands, I believe procedural clarity and transparency are essential for maintaining public confidence in the planning process.

I respectfully request that these questions be answered prior to the public hearing so residents and Council may fully understand the procedural history and current status of the application.

Sincerely,

Laurene Booker

[Date printed]

Heather Miller

From: Allen Wilkie Information Redacted as per POPIA (Protection of Privacy Act)
Sent: May 26, 2026 7:25 AM
To: Dev Assistant
Subject: Re: Bylaw 22-2017-2026 land redistricting AG1 to AR District



IRONSCALES couldn't recognize this email as this is the first time you received an email from this sender
awil6510@gmail.com

On Mon, May 25, 2026 at 4:14 PM Allen Wilkie Information Redacted as per POPIA (Protection of Privacy Act) wrote:

Dear Tanya ,

My name is Allen Wilkie ,my wife and I live directly across to the north of the property in question for redistricting, we have lived in Lac Ste Anne County my wife all her life and myself 30 years as I lived in parkland county 3 miles south of boarder where this gravel company currently operates as well as two other operators , that is were my families homestead is and my brother currently lives , he currently receives no services from parkland county , except for poor roads , dust , noise and unsightly views of what was once pristine farmland , some of our concerns are

1) Silicon Dioxide (silica dust)

Which contributes to silicosis , lung cancer , chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) , and kidney disease just to mention some of the more serious issues

2) Disruption of surface water / ground water and the effects it will/may have on neighbouring wetlands and wells

3) destruction of wildlife habitat, promotion of noxious weed growth in the area , disruption of peace and quiet time for adjacent property owners

4) property values will decrease

Here are some of the recommendations we would like the county to take into consideration and implement into all agreements should this be approved

1) increased set backs from adjacent properties and the county road (540)

2) five day a week dayshift only operations for crushing and hauling

3) large pre established sight/sound berms along the north boundary of the properties listed in the bylaw and along / around township road 540 and adjacent properties

We already hear noise from this operator and the two others operating in the same area . So In closing I am curious what will be the finacial gain to Lac Ste Anne County vs the disruption and inconvenience to the rate payers that will be affected if this bylaw is approved are the affected rate payers going to receive lower property taxes for their disruption/inconvenience ?

I ask that council and all involved in approving/disapproving this bylaw take it seriously when making their decision as I feel Lac Ste Anne County Council and those involved have a duty to its ratepayers

Thanks Allen and Lorna Wilkie