

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**

**B. DAYMOND**

**Bylaws 24/2024 (structure plan amendments) and 23/2024(land use Bylaw Amendments) Which one affects our neighborhood or both? Which bylaw are we objecting to?**

We bought the property at 177 Redwing Wynd with full knowledge of the approved plan for River Lot 22 backing on to our property. We were aware of the approval for future construction of a school and low density residential development.

Now less than 6 months later, River Lot 22 is being considered to include higher density apartment construction consisting of 100 or more units with a maximum height of 18 meters.

River Lot 22 is currently a beautiful undeveloped piece of land sloping towards the river and bordered by trees that must be well over 100 years old. Its beyond comprehension that most of those ancient trees will be bulldozed. It borders a well utilized and important Heritage Recreational Area. It is home to various types of wildlife including moose and deer that use the green space as a direct access to the river. While we are resigned to the loss of this natural beauty and wildlife with the development of low density residential, **we are opposed to the rezoning request to include medium density residential for the following reasons:**

1. Rankin Drive is severely under developed to accommodate the traffic it currently has to handle and already poses safety hazards that has resulted in calls for Traffic Calming measures.
2. Rankin Drive will be the single access and egress point for construction equipment, trades, and eventually residents and visitors. This poses a safety hazard that could result in delays to Medical, Fire and Protective Services access.
3. With the potential construction of the school on Rankin Drive and Riverside Drive, there will be the addition of school buses, transit, staff and parent drop off and pick up requirements. Larger residential structures will inevitably result in more occupants and developers will need to accommodate more vehicles on site creating problems related to automobile easements and parking.
4. Ongoing expansion of Redwing Wynd residential units already results in additional traffic on Rankin Drive and Riverside Drive to accommodate construction traffic.
5. **Obstruction of views due to a possible 18 meter high construction** in what already is and was proposed to be a primarily low density neighborhood.
6. Reduced property values due to medium density construction
7. Increased noise and potential for increase in crime and vandalism.
8. As of April 2024, there were 2,300 rental units under construction in St. Albert, many of them in Riverside subdivision. Is there a proven need for yet another building(s) in what is currently a low density neighborhood?

**Recommendation: Do not approve the medium density change to the already “Approved Area Structure Plan”. Leave it a “Low Density”**



Medium Density for Apartments

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT

C. HORNER

Dear Members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed medium density development, specially the apartments within our suburban community of Riverside. While I understand the need for housing development, I believe such a project is incompatible with the character, infrastructure, and financial realities of our area.

Our community is characterized by its suburban charm. Introducing this type of housing risks altering the fabric of our community, potentially leading to overcrowding, increased traffic congestion, and a decline in property values. Residents, including myself, chose this area specially for its suburban atmosphere and quality of life.

I urge the City Council to consider alternative approaches to meet housing needs that align more with our community's existing character and infrastructure. Zoning areas such as townhomes and duplexes could achieve growth without sacrificing the unique qualities that make our community desirable.

Thank you for considering the concerns of your citizens. I trust that the City Council will act in the best interest of our community and prioritize preserving its character, safety, and financial well-being.

Sincerely,  
Cassandra Horner

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**  
**D. NIXON**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Subject:** Bylaws 23/2024 & 24/2024 amendments Riverside  
**Date:** Monday, December 9, 2024 7:46:52 PM

---

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Hi,

The land pertaining to Bylaws 23/2024 and 24/2024 is a piece of heaven located near St. Albert's core. I encourage Council and Planning and Development to walk and view the land in person before making changes to this particular parcel of land. I ask Council to do everything in their power to preserve the natural forests that border the land to the west, east and north and make developers harmonize with nature rather than clear cut as this has been done too often in the development of the Riverside community.

Thank you,

Douglas Nixon

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**  
**G. BOURGEOIS**



It has come to our attention that application has been made to amend the “approved” ASP at the eastern end of Rankin Drive. This amendment would change the zoning of a large part of a parcel that was designated from primarily low density residential, to now primarily medium density residential.

Also, the information on the St Albert website suggests that consideration is being given to “updating the road layout so there is connectivity to Meadowview Lane” as outlined below in yellow.

- The city led amendment is an area of 4.16 hectares± (10.23 acres±). The proposed changes to land uses include - increasing the size and shape of the medium density site to enable development on it, retaining low density residential in the south portion of the amendment area, adding a public park to meet the required 10% municipal reserve dedication, adding stormwater management facility to support development, and updating the road layout so there is connectivity between LA Ventures’ land and Meadowview Lane. The location of Environmental Reserve will be updated to align with the Land Use Bylaw, Schedule G. The anticipated number of dwelling units in the existing Riverside ASP is 3,954, and no change in density is proposed for this amendment area.

There are two issues that we have with this proposed amendment.

1 – when we acquired our property in 2020, we specifically asked if Rankin Drive would be closed to traffic that may travel to and from Mission Avenue through the existing Grain Elevator Park area. We were advised by Avi Homes that the eastern end of Rankin Drive would be closed to that traffic, although a fire lane was intended for emergency access at the Meadowview Lane intersection.

If Rankin Drive is open to that traffic a substantial increase in the volumes along Rankin Drive would occur. A school is proposed on a site located just south of the location being considered. And a higher density development is also considered on the subject site.

It seems to us that the Grain Elevator Park will be negatively affected by the increase in the east west traffic along that section of Meadowview drive. This is especially true because of the pedestrian access to and from both sides of that heritage area. Also, all properties located west of the subject location and fronting Rankin Drive will be negatively affected by a substantial increase in traffic contrary to what was approved, and what was acceptable to us when we purchased the property.

2- The second issue we have is the increased density on the site itself. While we understand and accept the density of the lands located west of the Coop retail development and along a major artery, a high-density development in a “pocket” location such as Riverlot 22 not only seems out of place but is in complete contradiction to what every purchaser in this area understood would be developed at this location. Homes already developed and occupied on the lands adjacent to the west boundary of the subject property have a very legitimate concern in that a multi floor development will affect their right and expectation of privacy. Combining the increased traffic flow, and probable parking issues that will arise from such a development will clearly have an impact on the market value of properties adjacent if this amendment is approved.

We strongly oppose the proposed amendment to Riverlot 22 and if approved will seek a significant amendment to the assessed value of homes which will obviously be affected by this development.

Guy and Linda Bourgeois

139 Rankin Drive

St Albert Alberta

T8N 7X3

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**  
**G. BOUTESTEIN**

Greg & Nicole Boutestein  
175 Redwing Wynd  
St. Albert, Alberta  
T8N 8A5  
Mobile: (780) 862-2728 & (780) 938-2436

December 9, 2024

RE: PROPOSED RIVERSIDE AREA STRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT, LAND USE BYLAW,  
SCHEDULE A AMENDMENT

Select Engineering Consultants Ltd., on behalf of L.A. Ventures Inc., is requesting that Council approve changes to the Riverside Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 1/2012) and the Land Use Bylaw (9/2005). The proposed amendments would impact Riverlot 22 which is located south of Rankin Drive, east of Redwing Wynd, west of Meadowview Lane and north of the Sturgeon River.

When we selected the site for our new home at 175 Redwing Wynd in the spring of 2023, we did so with full knowledge of the existing approved plan for Riverlot 22 which indicated mainly low density residential development (RX) and only a small strip of medium density residential (R3A) along the north side of the lot. This is consistent with other town houses that are being built in the area along Redwing Wynd and Rankin Drive. What we were not expecting was a proposed amendment that would increase the area designated for R3A to 1.59 ha with a footprint that would be more conducive to erecting a building consisting of a maximum of a 149 units with a maximum height of 15 metres.

We are opposed to the most recent ASP amendment for the following two key reasons:

1. There are many other medium density apartments that are proposed and currently under construction in Riverside (as per Genstar's updated site map). These are clustered around the Rose Gate entrance to the subdivision and do not back directly onto the property lines of any low density residential homes. Is there a need for another such building in an area of the subdivision which is primarily surrounded by low density residential? Ask residents in single family dwelling that would back onto such a development how they would feel about having a 4-5 storey apartment building directly behind their backyard. This would certainly effect resell value of those residents.
2. The single access to this proposed development would be off of Rankin Drive. The City of St. Albert has already called for Traffic Calming measures in our subdivision. The increased traffic coming in and out of this proposed site would certainly put more stress on the exit route from the east side of Riverside (ie. Riverside Drive). If Rankin Drive is eventually connected to Meadowview Drive (about a block to the east of the access point to the proposed development) residents along Mission Avenue will undoubtedly feel the traffic impact as well. Parking may also become an issue as is already the case on Rose Gate where residents of the apartment buildings there often park on the road blocking one of two lanes designated for traffic entering the subdivision off of McKenney Avenue.

As much as we would like to see Riverlot 22 remain undeveloped with its mature forested wildlife corridor left intact, we built our retirement home at 175 Redwing Wynd with full knowledge that development would eventually occur behind us. However, we did our due diligence prior to purchasing and selected this part of Riverside as it was furtherer away from the multi-storey buildings that were being proposed on the west side. Based on the ASP we looked over in 2023, there was no indication of this type of multi-storey/multi-unit development being built on Riverlot 22. It was primarily designated as low density residential with narrower property footprints that would most likely accommodate town house developments along Rankin Drive. Had the current proposed ASP been on table when we built, we would have certainly decided to build elsewhere. I can attest that this is a common frustration amongst residents who have built in this area of Riverside.

As a final footnote, we feel that the medium-density residential (R3A) designation, as it currently stands, is too broad and should be reconsidered by St. Albert Council. The lack of a high-density residential designation needs to be addressed as it is very confusing what type of development will be constructed on areas with the medium-density designation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Greg & Nicole Boutestein

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**

**J. COSSITT**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Submission for public hearing Riverlot 22ASP and LUB amendment application in Riverside Tuesday Dec 17 at 2pm  
**Date:** Thursday, December 5, 2024 7:48:40 PM

---

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments.

- >
- > We purchased the property at 181 Redwing Wynd with full knowledge of the approved area structure plan for river lot 22.
- >
- > We have since been notified that there is a new proposed area structure plan increasing the density which could have up to a six story apartment with a large number of suites.
- >
- > We are now going to have our view obstructed by this large complex. We are OK with the original plan that appeared to have more of the town houses extended east on Rankin Drive and single-family on the remainder of the property.
- > This proposed change will increase the density in the area and increase the traffic and parking issues on a road (Rankin Drive ) that appears not to have been designed for this volume of traffic. In addition there is a designated school site across from the proposed complex which will have buses and increased parent ,children traffic and safety issues.
- > Also of note is adjacent to river lot 22 Genstar has just released 33 single lots and 20 duplex lots for building on Royal Street and River Hill Crescent that will also have vehicles feeding onto Rankin Drive creating more traffic challenges for residents.
- > We relocated to Saint Albert as we were attracted to the quality of life and amenities that Saint Albert promotes to attract people to live here. I trust you you will review the above and look not only at the short term but the long-term effects and issues that will affect not only us but future generations thank you for your attention to these issues.
- If you have any questions or if clarification is needed please contact us .
- > Barb and Jerry Cossitt
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**

**K. CASSIDY**



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Subject:** Zoning of Riverlot 22  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 10, 2024 9:59:47 AM

---

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed zoning changes for Riverlot 22, which is near my residence at 129 Rankin Drive. When I purchased my home, the zoning plan for Riverlot 22 was intended for medium-density housing and single-family residential properties. However, I understand there is now a proposal for a six-story apartment building on this site.

This significant increase in density would negatively impact an already busy and condensed area. The current road system is insufficient for the existing traffic and parking demands, leading to frequent congestion and safety concerns. In fact, prior to this proposal, we received a neighborhood survey regarding the addition of traffic-calming devices, further highlighting the area's existing traffic issues. It seems contradictory to consider adding a development that will increase traffic volume while simultaneously acknowledging the need to reduce it.

Furthermore, the proposed apartment building is adjacent to an elementary school. This raises serious safety concerns, as increased traffic, reduced visibility, and higher pedestrian activity would create a hazardous environment for children, parents, and school buses navigating the area. I have already witnessed similar challenges caused by an apartment complex at the west end of Rankin, which brought overcrowded parking, reduced sightlines, and heightened risks for pedestrians and drivers. These issues would only be magnified in proximity to a school site.

Additionally, I am concerned about the potential impact this development could have on property values in the area. Home values in residential neighborhoods are often influenced by the surrounding environment, and introducing a large apartment complex could lead to decreased desirability for prospective buyers, ultimately reducing property values for existing homeowners.

I strongly believe that the proposed zoning change would diminish the quality of life, safety, and property values in our neighborhood. I urge council to reconsider this proposal and prioritize a development plan that aligns with the community's needs and the original zoning intentions for Riverlot 22.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I hope we can work together to ensure responsible and sustainable development in our community.

Sincerely,

Karen Cassidy

129 Rankin Drive

Concerned Community Member

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**

**L. LAFLAMME**

## Renee McDonald

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 23, 2024 4:12 PM  
**To:** Hearings  
**Subject:** Written submission to Legislative Services

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

I bought a property at 179 Redwing Wynd in St. Albert with full knowledge of approved plan next to my property for Riverlot 22.

- I am not happy about a 6 storey apartment building to be built in the backyard.
- The view will be obstructed.
- Density and noise will become an issue.
- This will be a potential for increased crime and vandalism.
- There will be increased traffic and parking on an underdesigned local road.
- It will be adjacent to the school site, which will have buses and increased parent/children traffic. Safety of children and parents could be an issue.

This could reduce my property value.  
Louise Laflamme

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**

**M. MAIONE**

**To:**

Legislative Services  
Sajid Sifat  
Planner, Planning & Development  
City of St. Albert  
T8N3Z9

**From:**

Mike & Maureen Maione  
87 Riverside Drive  
St. Albert, Alberta, T8N7Y9  
mmaione@nait.ca  
780.919.8924  
November 28, 2024

**RE:**

Proposed changes to the zoning of area in Riverside  
River lot 22 ASP/LUB adjacent property  
6 Story Apartment Complex

Dear Sajid Sifat,

We have recently purchased a property in the Riverside area and have now been made aware of a proposed plan for River lot 22.

We are writing to express our strong objections to the proposed rezoning of the property adjacent to ours located at 87 Riverside Drive. The proposed rezoning would allow for the construction of a 6-storey apartment building, which would have severe and far-reaching consequences for our community.

My concerns regarding this proposal are numerous:

1. **Height and Density:** The proposed 6-storey building would be out of character with the existing neighborhood and would result in a significant increase in density. This would lead to a decrease in the quality of life for residents in the area.
2. **View Obstruction:** The construction of a 6-storey building would obstruct the views from my property, which would result in a significant decrease in my property value.
3. **Noise and Disruption:** The increased density and commercial activity would result in significant noise pollution and disruption to our peaceful enjoyment of our property.

4. **Potential for Increased Crime and Vandalism:** The increased density and foot traffic would create an environment conducive to increased crime and vandalism.

5. **Traffic and Parking Concerns:** The proposed development would result in increased traffic on our already congested local roads. Furthermore, the parking provisions for the development are inadequate, which would lead to parking spillover onto our local roads. We are already in the process of dealing with concerns due to traffic and have current consideration of our neighborhood introducing "traffic calming"

6. **Reduced Property Value:** The construction of a 6-storey apartment building next to my property would result in a significant decrease in my property value.

7. **Safety Concerns:** The proposed development is adjacent to a school site, which would result in increased traffic and congestion from buses and parents dropping off their children. This would create a significant safety risk for children and parents.

8. **Inconsistency with Community Plans:** The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with our community's plans and vision for the area, which prioritize preservation of our neighborhood's character and quality of life.

I urge you to reconsider the proposed rezoning and to prioritize the needs and concerns of our community. I believe that it is essential to ensure that any development or growth is done in a responsible and sustainable manner that respects the character and quality of life in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your serious attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mike & Maureen Maione

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT  
N. ROBERT



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Subject:** Riverside ASP amendment Dec 2024  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 10, 2024 1:23:11 PM

---

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Good afternoon, City Council:

Please accept this as a written submission to Council on the proposed amendment to the Riverside ASP for which there will be a public hearing on December 17, 2024. I wish that I could present in person; however, work commitments prevent me from doing so.

I made an initial written submission to the proponent and Council on June 11, 2024, and, as such, I'm confident that you are aware of my concerns with the proposal before you. The purpose of making another submission is to highlight my concerns and offer some additional comments.

My main concern is that I object to the possibility of an apartment building being constructed on the east end of Rankin Drive instead of carrying on with a lower density development. Based on the assessment of the feedback heard by Select Engineering Consultants during the written submission process my concerns are broadly shared among our residents. It's frustrating to me that medium density designations can include townhouses or apartment buildings. They are such different developments and impact a community differently and should not be lumped together in a single category. I would be supportive of approval to build townhouses but not an apartment building. Despite the assessment of our written feedback I disagree that the construction of an apartment building in that location would not impact traffic, the character of the neighbourhood, crowding, property values, etc. Of course it would! If you build an apartment building there will be a lot more people living on that plot of land and driving in and out of the neighbourhood than if you instead built townhouses. If I'm selling my single family home and it's across the street from another quiet street with similar homes I'm going to be able to sell that house for more than if it's across the street from an apartment building.

I am well aware of the need for offering a variety of housing options to residents of St. Albert in order for the city to continue to grow and flourish and I am not trying to make a NIMBY argument. In Riverside, along with single family homes (which were always supposed to dominate the neighbourhood as they do in all St. Albert neighbourhoods) there are entire streets of duplexes and laned homes, row upon row of townhouses, two apartment buildings, with two more seemingly under construction, and a nearly completed seniors' care home. What I'm trying to say is, "We're doing our part!" Since we're doing our part why are we now being asked to do even more? In looking at the ASP documents the plan for Riverside is 20% medium density and 20% high density. For comparison purposes I reviewed the Jensen Lakes ASP. What I found was that its plan for medium density is 17% and for high density is 11% in phase 1 and 0% in phase 2. Why are the percentages for medium and high density residential in Jensen Lakes so much less than they are in Riverside? Another obvious question is why are there no apartment buildings in Jensen Lakes but four (two completed and two under construction) in Riverside with one more being contemplated in

this latest ASP amendment? If I was attending the public hearing I would ask that question of Council so I am hoping a councilor will address it during the hearing.

I have lived in St. Albert for 27 years and one of the things that always made it so special was the care taken to ensure that each neighbourhood was well planned with a variety of housing options, aesthetics, resident enjoyment, functionality, and integration with the trail system front of mind. The original Riverside plan that I saw was all those things. However, now as we're addressing the third major ASP amendment since I moved in, it feels like the developer is just cramming in whatever will make it the most money for the least effort. After investing money in a community, residents should be able to rely on the ASP not changing so significantly that the entire character of the neighbourhood is lost. I strongly urge City Council to take your responsibility as representatives of your constituents seriously. Genstar Developments did not elect you; the people of St. Albert did. And these people of St. Albert who live in Riverside do not want this change to our neighbourhood.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views on these issues.

Regards,

Nancy Robert  
Riverside resident

**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT**  
**R. MIKALONIS**



---

## Public Hearing for Riverlot 22 ASP

---

**From** [REDACTED]  
**Date** Tue 2024-12-03 10:58 AM  
**To** Hearings <Hearings@stalbert.ca>

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

We would like to comment on the information we have seen concerning proposed changes to the zoning of this area in Riverside.

We recently purchased a property at 115 Rankin Drive with knowledge of the plan for Riverlot 22, being medium density and single family residential. We understand that a 6 story apartment building is now being proposed for this site. We feel that the added density of an apartment complex would overwhelm the existing road system creating traffic and noise issues as well as parking problems. Traffic issues are already a concern in this neighbourhood as we are currently being considered for "traffic calming". It doesn't seem reasonable to add to the problem by increasing the amount of traffic and parked vehicles. The proposed apartment would also be adjacent to the school site which will have buses and increased parent and child traffic associated with it. The added traffic and parking issues that an apartment across the street would create should be a huge concern for the safety of children and other pedestrians. I think all of us have experienced children that are less than fully attentive around schools- hence the need for school zones. I don't think there is any other school site in St. Albert that has to deal with this kind of density immediately around it.

The west end of Rankin Drive currently has a very large apartment complex and because of the additional parking around it, the reduced sight lines make turning in this area more dangerous. I can't imagine adding a school next to it. We don't know when the school will be built, but it will be at some point and until then the park is used for children to play and for soccer. The use of it will likely continue to expand. Even this use has resulted in traffic congestion to the point that Riverside Drive, in and around the school site, is almost reduced to a single lane of traffic due to street parking at these times. An apartment would result in adding many more cars to this area which will only increase traffic and congestion.

Overall, we feel that if council were to choose to go ahead with this change in zoning, the quality of life in this neighbourhood would be significantly diminished.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns,

Rick and Judy Mikalonis

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC INPUT  
S. TROUGHTON

Shanen Troughton  
187 Redwing Wynd  
St Albert, Alberta, T8N 7Z2  
shanentroughton@gmail.com  
780-905-9349

November 28, 2024

City of Saint Albert  
Legislative Services

Dear Members of the Planning and Development Department,

**Re: Public Hearing scheduled for December 17, 2024 - Petition to Rezone Riverlot 22 to increase the density of the area**

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the land behind my home at 187 Redwing Wynd to increase the residential density. As a resident of St Albert, I chose this location specifically for the community's thoughtful planning, which prioritizes balanced development, green spaces, and liveability.

The initial zoning for this land was a significant factor in my decision to purchase my home. Concerns brought forward in previous community engagement still remain. Increasing the density in this area would have several negative impacts on me as a homeowner and this growing and thriving community, including but not limited to:

**1. Increased Traffic and Parking Challenges**

Increased traffic from a higher density apartment building is especially concerning for the parents and children that will attend the new school. Higher density developments significantly increase vehicle traffic in a neighbourhood, leading to congestion, noise pollution, and safety risks for pedestrians and children. Parking overflow from apartment buildings often spills into surrounding streets, disrupting residents' daily lives.

**2. Incompatibility with Neighbourhood Character**

In the proposal for higher density apartments, current homeowners along Redwing Wynd will back onto a large apartment/parking lot instead of the backyard of a single-family home. This is a barrier to building a sense of community that St Albert is known for. It decreases safety and security and also block light and decrease privacy. Additional higher density housing in our neighbourhood is incompatible with the aesthetic and character of our neighbourhood, which was designed to promote a sense of community and privacy. Such a drastic change could erode the qualities that make our area appealing and liveable.

**3. Environmental Concerns**

It appears that the proposal has provided for more environmental reserve and storm management area as it would be difficult for the developer to build in the location. The new proposed park between the medium and low-density development might be beneficial to future buyers in Riverlot 22 but does not benefit the current homeowners along Redwing Wynd. Maintaining the greenspace already existing along the fence line of the homes along Redwing Wynd would preserve the existing natural treed area and the animals that live there. This along with honouring the original lower density zoning would be beneficial to our fabulous community and us as homeowners. While I understand the need for diverse housing options, it is already zoned for high-density housing on each end of Rankin Drive. By keeping the current zoning intact, the city would preserve the long-term integrity and vision of our community's planning.

I urge the City of Saint Albert to honour its original zoning plan and reject the petition for rezoning this land to increase the density. Thank you for considering the voices of residents who will be directly affected by this decision. I would also respectfully request that St Albert citizens in our community be at the table for any further discussions or decisions about planning for our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Shanen and Brian Troughton  
[Shanentroughton@gmail.com](mailto:Shanentroughton@gmail.com)  
780-905-9349