

WHAT WE HEARD:

Foothills Regional Airport Land Use Project





ENGAGEMENT SNAPSHOT

The purpose of the Airport Land Use Project includes three principle goals: redesignate lands surrounding the airport from the Direct Control District #5 (DC5) to more appropriate land use districts supporting the actual uses on those lands, amend the DC5 district to better implement provisions for uses on the airport properties, and introduce an Airport Protection Overlay which would allow for the continued safe operation of the Airport and protection from surrounding uses.

In an effort to gain an understanding of the perceptions and goals of residents within 4 km of the airport and the users at the airport, administration undertook an engagement project. Engagement involved direct mail out to affected landowners and airport lessees, posting of notification signage for the project at the airport, direct mailed questionnaires to DC5 landowners, one-on-one meetings and phone conversations, an open house, and a survey available during the open house and online.



205 Individual landowners notified by direct mail



Approximately 35 individuals attended the Open House



~80% of Open House attendees own land or reside within the study area



3 Direct Control District #5 Survey responses received

4 Open House / Online survey responses received



57% of respondents live in the study area

KEY THEMES:

- 100% of the Open House/Online Survey answers identified support for the airport.
- The Open House was well attended; unfortunately, very few individuals chose to complete the survey.
- No major concerns or opposition to the project were expressed during open house, through survey submissions, or during in-person meetings.



SURVEY RESULTS

Two surveys were completed for the purpose of guiding the Airport Land Use Project, consisting of a DC#5 Landowner directed survey and a subsequent general public survey following the Open House.

Landowners of Direct Control District #5 Survey:

The first survey was specifically developed for landowners of Direct Control District #5 properties surrounding the airport with individually curated questions to determine current use of their lands, understand and identify any potential development goals or desires, and any concerns they may have with the proposed Land Use Redesignation of their land and proposed Airport Protection Overlay. This survey also included an invitation for landowners to meet with staff in-person or discuss over the phone:

- This survey was sent to 11 landowners.
- 3 landowners returned their completed surveys.
- 4 landowners participated in one-on-one in-person or phone discussions with staff.

Responses:

Written responses within the submitted surveys as well as verbal discussions during one-on-one and phone conversations included the following topics:

- Consideration and desire for future subdivision.
- Ability to install personal solar facilities.
- Concern for building height limitations near airport.
- Possibility of future gravel extraction.
- Concern if limitations to agricultural activities, including dugouts.
- Concerns for non-compliance at airport (specifically overnight accommodations/residences at airport, non-flight related use of hangars, personal storage)
- Concern for frequency of flights/landings by flight school.
- Airport nuisance and hours of operation.
- Management, enforcement, and discipline of irresponsible and unsafe flying.
- New house, house additions, permitted buildings, and agricultural buildings.
- Suggestion and request for other businesses opportunities near airport; such as, intensive vegetation (tree farms, greenhouses), RV and Mini Storage (indoor vs. outdoor), home based businesses, rural business, and general industry.
- Concern for limiting ability to have wind turbines.

Conclusion:

This survey provided opportunity for directly affected landowners to express and discuss general topics and have their questions answered, while also providing staff with an understanding of common topics of concern.

Responses and comments provided through this initial landowner consultation did not illuminate any major concerns or limitations of the land use redesignation plan or the draft airport protection overlay. Most landowners wanted to ensure that their ability to continue their agricultural operation and typical acreage activities would be permitted. One landowner expressed desire to conduct more intensive activities on their property; staff discussed process, feasibility, and requirements with that individual landowner should they wish to proceed with such an application.

Open House / Feedback Survey:

The second survey was open to the general public with paper copies available during the Open House and QR links available for online completion following the Open House. A link to this survey was also made available on the Foothills County Website and signage posted at the airport and Joint Administration Building in High River.

This survey contained seven questions to gauge participants' general support or opposition to the airport, their location/proximity to the airport and interest in the project, as well to seek feedback regarding the draft proposed uses within the airport district, and opportunity to provide general comments to the County.

Only four surveys were returned following the Open House and one additional written response was received. All surveys and responses have been included within Appendix A for reference.

Due to the low number of completed surveys, staff is unable to extrapolate accurate outcomes; however, comments provided may be considered in drafting the proposed Airport District, Airport Protection Overlay, and Redesignation Plan for surrounding Direct Control District #5 properties.

The results of the survey were as follows: *(responses in no particular order)*

(Questions 1 and 2 are multiple choice)

Question 1:

Where do you live (or own land)?

Responses:

- 1 - within 4 km of the airport
- 1 - in Foothills County but further than 4km from airport.
- 1 - in High River.
- 1 - Other: Calgary.

Question 2:

Would you describe yourself as a supporter of the airport or in opposition to the airport?

Responses:

- 3 - Support Airport.
- 1 - *No Answer.

(Questions 3 through 7 are written response)

Question 3:

Are there additional uses that you would like to see the Foothills County consider on Airside and/or Groundside properties at the airport?

Responses:

- "Looks Good."
- "Light manufacturing, warehousing, small office or professional services."
- "Restaurant / coffee shop."

Question 4:

Are there any uses listed at the open house that you feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

Responses:

- "Vehicle storage or any other type of personal vehicle, water craft, recreational vehicle use. It's an airport!"
- "Even Groundside Uses should have some connection with Aviation, or benefit from being located near an airport. Otherwise, these users will not be supportive of leaseholders paying a fair share to support airport expenses. Solar farm installations should only be considered if they are installed on top of buildings, which means they take up no additional space. The airport may wish to install solar generation on top of existing buildings as a way to generate revenue for the airport."

Question 5:

Are there other uses not listed at the open house that you have concerns about or feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

Responses:

- "I feel all could be deemed appropriate, but would suggest some restrictions around flight schools to keep traffic reasonable and safe for the airports neighbours off the end of the runways. Large volumes of air traffic can be a nuisance and detrimental to land values and peaceful country living."
- "Cannabis operations."

Question 6:

Are there any proposed Permitted, Discretionary, or Exempt uses which you feel should be moved to another category? (Please explain)

Responses:

- "No."

Question 7:

Do you have any other questions or general comments you wish to share?

Responses:

- “Any thoughts about certification of the airport?”
- “The final Airport Area Structure Plan should not in anyway impose additional restrictions on existing leaseholders beyond what is already included in their current leases. In 9.0 Policies, Section 9.2 Airside, Line 1. should read, “Any use to be located on airside lands must be primarily an aviation use that requires direct access to the runway.” The use of this wording will avoid future conflicts around people storing non-aviation items in their hangars, in addition to their aircraft. What is lists in the document as Runway 14/32, is now redesignated Runway 15/33, per the latest Canada Flight Supplement.”
- “It may be necessary to work with federal aeronautical groups to modify some typical flight routes for flight schools to minimize impact on neighbours. Noise can be significant at times of high traffic and twin engine aircraft in particular are disruptive.”



OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK

Verbal Comments and Questions received during the Open House:

The following is a list of noted comments and questions discussed between attending staff, Councillors, and interested parties during the open house, hosted on November 28th, 2023:

General Feedback, Comments, and Questions:

- The airport should fund itself; County residents should not be subsidizing the airport through property taxes.
- No concerns as long as the new policies do not limit the ability to continue farming/general agriculture, build a house or agricultural building on properties near the airport.
- The County should not use “landing fees” as a form of revenue generation.
- Flight schools and/or training pilots should pay per landing/flight due to frequency and greater usage and wear on runways.
- Enforcement, usage fees, or better management of the number of “touch and go” landings and training circuits by flight schools and training pilots. These create significant nuisance to neighbours due to frequency of passes over neighbouring properties.
- Airport or flight schools should better manage their training circuit routes to mitigate frequent passes over individual neighbouring properties.

- Airport or County should enforce non-permitted uses at the airport: overnight/residential occupancy of hangars, storage of non-flight related vehicles or personal items, and unsafe pilots or dangerous flying.
- Uses at the airport should be airplane or flight related, not in support of other businesses or general industrial park at airport.
- Several questions regarding landowner's ability to have personal solar on lands surrounding the airport and the impact of proposed policies on their ability to do so.
- The airport is a utility, just like roads, and should be supported and funded by the community and all residents as it is an asset to the community. Airports shouldn't be expected to be self funding, that would be like having all roads as toll roads.
- Airports should not be near residential properties. Commercial and industrial uses are more compatible with airport use and noise.
- Desire by lessees to have access to water supply and wastewater services. Water would open up ability to support a variety of businesses and diversify revenue sources.
- County should consider alternative sources of revenue such as inviting film industry to utilize airport or allow rental of airport/runway to car clubs. May require temporary closing of runway during events.
- The airport does not provide any services, revenue, or amenities to the community. It is just a subsidized hobby for pilots, they should pay for it themselves.
- County should allow/encourage solar panels on hangars.
- Process to get new hangars approved is too long and arduous.
- Rules for hangar design/aesthetics are too limiting. Want more variety of colour and material options.
- Airport lessees should have more freedom of use of their hangars. As long as they have an airplane, they should not be limited to what else can be stored or other uses of the hangars.
- There were questions from landowners of DC5 parcels outside of the airport lands regarding how a rezoning might impact what they can do with their property, some just wanted to be sure that they could continue using the parcel for agriculture and a residence, others wanted to know if they would be able to have a business on their property if it were rezoned to CR.
- Landowners of DC 5 properties outside of the airport had questions about what districts they could be redesignated to other than Country Residential or Agricultural, such as for commercial, industrial, or gravel pit uses.
- The airport creates unacceptable negative impacts and risk on nearby properties and should be closed.



CONCLUSIONS

Foothills County undertook the engagement project from May 2023 through December 2023 to gather residents' and airport users' opinions about the Foothills Regional Airport, the proposed land use redesignation plan, and the proposed Airport Protection Overlay. The project involved direct mail out, one-on-one in-person and phone meetings with landowners, engagement with the Airport Board members, notification and invitation to neighbouring landowners, airport lessees, and general public to the open house, and feedback survey.

The results of this survey will be considered by Council along with consideration of current best practices with respect to regional airport land uses, neighbouring land uses, and protection of lands within the within a 4km radius area surrounding the airport through the Airport Protection Overlay and as defined by the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces.

It should be noted that minimum/maximum requirements, standard procedures, best practices, and considerations identified within the TP1247E: Aviation Land Use in the Vicinity of Aerodromes document and the SOR/96/96-433: Canadian Aviation Regulations, are under the Jurisdiction of Transportation Canada.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Submitted responses to Direct Control District #5 Landowner Questions

APPENDIX B – Verbatim responses to Open House / Feedback Survey

APPENDIX C – Submitted Written Response

APPENDIX A - Submitted responses to Direct Control District #5 Landowner Questions

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Bishop,

Subject Properties: 160+/- acres – SW 20-18-28 W4M & 159.6+/- acres SE 20-18-28 W4M

County records indicate that you own the two above noted properties which are currently designated (zoned) under the Direct Control District #5 (DC5). This land use district was intended to protect the Airport lands from encroaching uses that may negatively impact the operational safety of the airport facility.

Foothills County is looking to redesignate (rezone) both of your properties to an appropriate land use district with the goal of simplifying development application processes, reducing confusion caused by this DC5 land use district, and allowing for continued use of your lands for the intended purposes, while still providing a level of protection to ensure the operational safety of the airport and its uses.

The following statements and questions are intended to provide the County with an understanding of how you use your land, in order to determine an appropriate new land use district for your properties. It is the County's assumption that most properties near the airport would be redesignated to either Country Residential District (CR) if under 21 acres in size, or Agricultural District (A) if 21 acres or larger; noting that both "Agriculture, General" and "Dwelling, Single Family" are permitted uses under both CR and A land use districts.

Please confirm/provide clarification regarding the following points:

- 1) Are there currently any buildings located on SE 20-18-28 W4M? Are there any other improvements, other than dugouts, fencing, driving surfaces, water well(s)?

No and no.

- 2) Are there any current uses of SE 20-18-28 W4M other than for General Agricultural purposes?

No

- 3) Are there any current uses of SW 20-18-28 W4M other than for General Agricultural and Residential/Personal purposes?

No

- 4) Other than General Agricultural operations, are any businesses operated on or from either of your properties? If so, is it a "home-based business" (i.e., you live and work on site), or standalone commercial operation (i.e., the business is operated by someone other than residents/owner of the property)?

No.

- 5) Is there a new use or development that you plan to proceed with on either of your properties in the near future but that is not currently occurring? (e.g. new building(s), future business, subdivision of property, gravel/sand extraction)

Not sure what "near future" means to you, but possible sand/gravel or subdivision.

6) Being that both of your properties are unsubdivided quarter sections and appear to be used for General Agricultural and Residential/Personal purposes, it would be the County's assumption that the Agricultural District would be the most suitable and appropriate land use zoning for both of your properties.

- Do you agree with this? Or, is there a different land use district that you feel would better align with your use or desired use of your properties?

I believe that I agree, I am not an expert in zoning rules.

7) Do you have concerns or opposition to your properties being redesignated to the Agricultural Land Use District?

Not if it doesn't hinder any of my future plans.

The Airport Protection Overlay is proposed to be implemented on all properties within 4 km of the Airport runways and may limit some uses on those lands, such as: wind and solar installations, telecommunication towers, and over-height structures, as well as uses that may create dust, smoke, steam, glare, electronic interference, or attract birds. Proposed development within this overlay area may require a Development Permit to confirm that the proposal will not create safety hazards for the airport operations, or to mitigate any potential concerns. All of the properties currently designated as Direct Control District #5 are within this proposed overlay area, as well the overlay will be implemented on properties with "normal" land use designations (i.e. Agricultural, Country Residential, and Natural Resource Extraction[Gravel Pits]) within the 4 km area.

8) Do you have concerns that the proposed protection overlay would impact the use and/or enjoyment of your property?

Yes - height restrictions

9) If you also own other properties which are within 4km of the High River Regional Airport, but are not designated within the DC5 District, do you have concerns with the proposed Airport Overlay impacting the use and/or enjoyment of your other properties?

N/A.

10) Do you have any other questions or comments regarding the proposed Airport Protection Overlay? Please elaborate (you are also welcomed/encouraged to bring any questions to your in-person/phone meeting):

I would probably just ask questions.

The County invites you to schedule an in-person meeting, or phone conversation, with County Planning Staff to discuss your properties and any questions you may have regarding the proposed redesignation of the Direct Control District #5 properties and the proposed Airport Protection Overlay.

Please return your completed survey to Drew.Granson@FoothillsCountyab.ca (photo or scan), mail to/drop off at the Foothills County Administration office, or bring with you for your scheduled in person meeting. Thank you.

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Tschetter,

Subject Properties: 141+/- acres – NE 7-18-28 W4M & 9.5+/- acres Plan 1112790, Block 1, Lot 1

County records indicate that you own the two above noted properties which are currently designated (zoned) under the Direct Control District #5 (DC5). This land use district was intended to protect the Airport lands from encroaching uses that may negatively impact the operational safety of the airport facility.

Foothills County is looking to redesignate (rezone) both of your properties to an appropriate land use district with the goal of simplifying development application processes, reducing confusion caused by this DC5 land use district, and allowing for continued use of your lands for the intended purposes, while still providing a level of protection to ensure the operational safety of the airport and its uses.

The following statements and questions are intended to provide the County with an understanding of how you use your land, in order to determine an appropriate new land use district for your property. It is the County's assumption that most properties near the airport would be redesignated to either Country Residential District (CR) if under 21 acres in size, or Agricultural District (A) if 21 acres or larger; noting that both "Agriculture, General" and "Dwelling, Single Family" are permitted uses under both CR and A land use districts.

Please confirm/provide clarification regarding the following points:

- 1) Excepting the recently approved buildings under Development Permit 22D113, are there any other buildings located on the 141+/- acre portion of NE 7-18-28 W4M? Are there any other improvements, other than dugouts, fencing, driving surfaces, water well(s)?

NO

- 2) Are there any current uses of the 141+/- acre portion of NE 7-18-28 W4M other than for General Agricultural purposes?

NO

- 3) Are there any current uses of the 9.5+/- acre Plan 1112790, Block 1, Lot 1 other than for General Agricultural and Residential/Personal purposes?

NO

- 4) Other than General Agricultural operations, are any businesses operated on or from either of your properties? If so, is it a "home-based business" (i.e., you live and work on site), or standalone commercial operation (i.e., the business is operated by someone other than residents/owner of the property)?

NO

- 5) Is there a new use or development that you plan/want to proceed with on your property in the near future but that is not currently occurring? (e.g. future business, subdivision of property, gravel/sand extraction)

House extension + solar (potentially)

6) Being that both of your properties appear to be used for General Agricultural purposes and the 9.5+/- acre parcel for Residential/Personal use, it would be the County's assumption that the Agricultural District would be the most suitable and appropriate land use zoning for the 141+/- acre parcel and that the Country Residential District would be most appropriate land use zoning for your 9.5+/- acre parcel.

- Do you agree with this? Or, is there a different land use district that you feel would better align with your use or desired use of your properties? (Please explain if you feel otherwise)

DON'T KNOW

7) Do you have concerns or opposition to your properties being redesignated to the Agricultural Land Use District and Country Residential Land Use District as noted above?

DON'T KNOW

The Airport Protection Overlay is proposed to be implemented on all properties within 4 km of the Airport runways and may limit some uses on those lands, such as: wind and solar installations, telecommunication towers, and over-height structures, as well as uses that may create dust, smoke, steam, glare, electronic interference, or attract birds. Proposed development within this overlay area may require a Development Permit to confirm that the proposal will not create safety hazards for the airport operations, or to mitigate any potential concerns. All of the properties currently designated as Direct Control District #5 are within this proposed overlay area, as well the overlay will be implemented on properties with "normal" land use designations (i.e., Agricultural, Country Residential, and Natural Resource Extraction [Gravel Pits]) within the 4 km area.

8) Do you have concerns that the proposed protection overlay would impact the use and/or enjoyment of your property?

Yes. Would like to put solar panels to reduce energy costs.

9) If you also own other properties which are within 4km of the High River Regional Airport, but are not designated within the DC5 District, do you have concerns with the proposed Airport Overlay impacting the use and/or enjoyment of your other properties?

10) Do you have any other questions or comments regarding the proposed Airport Protection Overlay? Please elaborate. (you are also welcomed/encouraged to bring any questions to your in-person/phone meeting):

Who manages the airport and governs people living there. Manages and disciplines people who fly irresponsibly and unsafely.

The County invites you to schedule an in-person meeting, or phone conversation, with County Planning Staff to discuss your properties and any questions you may have regarding the proposed redesignation of the Direct Control District #5 properties and the proposed Airport Protection Overlay.

Please return your completed survey to Drew.Granson@FoothillsCountyab.ca (photo or scan), mail to/drop off at the Foothills County Administration office, or bring with you for your scheduled in person meeting. Thank you.

JUN - 8 2023

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Nichols,

Subject Property: 49.52+/- acre portion of N 25-18-29 W4M; Plan 0213189, Block 2, Lot 1

County records indicate that you own the above noted property which is currently designated (zoned) under the Direct Control District #5 (DC5). This land use district was intended to protect the Airport lands from encroaching uses that may negatively impact the operational safety of the airport facility.

Foothills County is looking to redesignate (rezone) your property to an appropriate land use district with the goal of simplifying development application processes, reducing confusion caused by this DC5 land use district, and allowing for continued use of your lands for the intended purposes, while still providing a level of protection to ensure the operational safety of the airport and its uses.

The following statements and questions are intended to provide the County with an understanding of how you use your land, in order to determine an appropriate new land use district for your property. It is the County's assumption that most properties near the airport would be redesignated to either Country Residential District (CR) if under 21 acres in size, or Agricultural District (A) if 21 acres or larger; noting that both "Agriculture, General" and "Dwelling, Single Family" are permitted uses under both CR and A land use districts.

Please confirm/provide clarification regarding the following points:

- 1) Are there any current uses of your property other than for General Agricultural and Residential/Personal purposes?

NO

- 2) Other than General Agricultural operations, are any businesses operated on or from your property? If so, is it a "home-based business" (i.e., you live and work on site), or standalone commercial operation (i.e., the business is operated by someone other than residents/owner of the property)?

None

- 3) Is there a new use or development that you plan to proceed with on your property in the near future but that is not currently occurring? (e.g. future business, subdivision of property, gravel/sand extraction)

Not at present

- 4) Being that your property appears to be used for General Agricultural and Residential/Personal purposes, it would be the County's assumption that the Agricultural District would be the most suitable and appropriate land use zoning for your property.

NO

- Do you agree with this? Or, is there a different land use district that you feel would better align with your use or desired use of your property?

I Feel this property would be better zoned as country residential

5) Do you have concerns or opposition to your property being redesignated to the Agricultural Land Use District?

I would like to see it country residential
for easier subdivision.

The Airport Protection Overlay is proposed to be implemented on all properties within 4 km of the Airport runways and may limit some uses on those lands, such as: wind and solar installations, telecommunication towers, and over-height structures, as well as uses that may create dust, smoke, steam, glare, electronic interference, or attract birds. Proposed development within this overlay area may require a Development Permit to confirm that the proposal will not create safety hazards for the airport operations, or to mitigate any potential concerns. All of the properties currently designated as Direct Control District #5 are within this proposed overlay area, as well the overlay will be implemented on properties with "normal" land use designations (i.e., Agricultural, Country Residential, and Natural Resource Extraction [Gravel Pits]) within the 4 km area.

6) Do you have concerns that the proposed protection overlay would impact the use and/or enjoyment of your property?

No

7) If you also own other properties which are within 4km of the High River Regional Airport, but are not designated within the DC5 District, do you have concerns with the proposed Airport Overlay impacting the use and/or enjoyment of your other properties?

N/A

8) Do you have any other questions or comments regarding the proposed Airport Protection Overlay? Please elaborate. (you are also welcomed/encouraged to bring any questions to your in-person/phone meeting):

The County invites you to schedule an in-person meeting, or phone conversation, with County Planning Staff to discuss your properties and any questions you may have regarding the proposed redesignation of the Direct Control District #5 properties and the proposed Airport Protection Overlay.

Please return your completed survey to Drew.Granson@FoothillsCountyab.ca (photo or scan), mail to/drop off at the Foothills County Administration office, or bring with you for your scheduled in person meeting. Thank you.

APPENDIX B – Verbatim responses to Open House / Feedback Survey

[View results](#)

Respondent

2

Anonymous

16:40

Time to complete

1. Where do you live (or own land)?

- within 4km from the airport.
- in Foothills County but further than 4km from airport.
- in High River.
- Other

2. Would you describe yourself as a supporter of the airport or in opposition to the airport?

- Support Airport
- Oppose Airport
- Somewhere between (e.g. okay with airport but don't want it to grow)
- Other

3. Are there additional uses that you would like to see the Foothills County consider on Airside and/or Groundside properties at the airport?

Restaurant/ coffee shop.

4. Are there any uses listed at the open house that you feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

Vehicle storage or any other type of personal vehicle, water craft, recreational vehicle use. It's an airport!

5. Are there other uses not listed at the open house that you have concerns about or feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

Cannabis operations.

6. Are there any proposed Permitted, Discretionary, or Exempt uses which you feel should be moved to another category? (please explain)

No

7. Do you have any other questions or general comments you wish to share?

Any thoughts about certification of the airport?

View results

Respondent

3

Anonymous

37:43

Time to complete

1. Where do you live (or own land)?

- within 4km from the airport.
- in Foothills County but further than 4km from airport.
- in High River.
- Other

2. Would you describe yourself as a supporter of the airport or in opposition to the airport?

- Support Airport
- Oppose Airport
- Somewhere between (e.g. okay with airport but don't want it to grow)
- Other

3. Are there additional uses that you would like to see the Foothills County consider on Airside and/or Groundside properties at the airport?

Light manufacturing, warehousing, small office or professional services

4. Are there any uses listed at the open house that you feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

5. Are there other uses not listed at the open house that you have concerns about or feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

I feel all could be deemed appropriate, but would suggest some restrictions around flight schools to keep traffic reasonable and safe for the airports neighbours off the end of the runways. Large volumes of air traffic can be a nuisance and detrimental to land values and peaceful country living

6. Are there any proposed Permitted, Discretionary, or Exempt uses which you feel should be moved to another category? (please explain)

7. Do you have any other questions or general comments you wish to share?

It may be necessary to work with federal aeronautical groups to modify some typical flight routes for flight schools to minimize impact on neighbours. Noise can be significant at times of high traffic and twin engine aircraft in particular are disruptive

View results

Respondent

4 Anonymous

36:20

Time to complete

1. Where do you live (or own land)?

- within 4km from the airport.
- in Foothills County but further than 4km from airport.
- in High River.
- Calgary, but I work at CEN4

2. Would you describe yourself as a supporter of the airport or in opposition to the airport?

- Support Airport
- Oppose Airport
- Somewhere between (e.g. okay with airport but don't want it to grow)
- Other

3. Are there additional uses that you would like to see the Foothills County consider on Airside and/or Groundside properties at the airport?

4. Are there any uses listed at the open house that you feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

Even Groundside Uses should have some connection with Aviation, or benefit from being located near an airport. Otherwise, these users will not be supportive of leaseholders paying a fair share to support airport expenses. Solar farm installations should only be considered if they are installed on top of buildings, which means they take up no additional space. The airport may wish to install solar generation on top of existing buildings as a way to generate revenue for the airport.

5. Are there other uses not listed at the open house that you have concerns about or feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

6. Are there any proposed Permitted, Discretionary, or Exempt uses which you feel should be moved to another category? (please explain)

7. Do you have any other questions or general comments you wish to share?

The final Airport Area Structure Plan should not in anyway impose additional restrictions on existing leaseholders beyond what is already included in their current leases.

In 9.0 Policies, Section 9.2 Airside, Line 1. should read, "Any use to be located on airside lands must be primarily an aviation use that requires direct access to the runway." The use of this wording will avoid future conflicts around people storing non-aviation items in their hangars, in addition to their aircraft.

What is listed in the document as Runway 14/32, is now redesignated Runway 15/33, per the latest Canada Flight Supplement.

View results

Respondent

5

Anonymous

00:28

Time to complete

1. Where do you live (or own land)?

- within 4km from the airport.
- in Foothills County but further than 4km from airport.
- in High River.
- Other

2. Would you describe yourself as a supporter of the airport or in opposition to the airport?

- Support Airport
- Oppose Airport
- Somewhere between (e.g. okay with airport but don't want it to grow)
- Other

3. Are there additional uses that you would like to see the Foothills County consider on Airside and/or Groundside properties at the airport?

Looks good.

4. Are there any uses listed at the open house that you feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

5. Are there other uses not listed at the open house that you have concerns about or feel would be inappropriate at the airport?

6. Are there any proposed Permitted, Discretionary, or Exempt uses which you feel should be moved to another category? (please explain)

7. Do you have any other questions or general comments you wish to share?

APPENDIX C – Submitted Written Response

Regional Airport Land Use Project Survey and Feedback
From Delbert and Helen Edey.

We have three parcels of land within the proposed area, one that is currently not listed in the DC5 area approximately .8 km south of the airport and two other parcels in the DC5 area approximately .8 km north of the airport.

OTHER:

We have nothing against airports but they shouldn't be in an area with multiple residences. If there is an airport it should be surrounded by light industry in an area where aircraft noise would blend in with the noise of operating businesses.

OTHER:

We have nothing against the airport but feel it should be operated with the same restrictions as everything else within the County. It should stand on its own financially and should not be a drain on taxpayers. It should be operated on a user pay system. The airport now wants to use taxpayer lands to sell off to pay for maintenance and new additions. We don't use the airport and don't feel we should help pay for its operation. If you did an audit I am sure you would find mostly private planes used for personal pleasure. Currently the airport is being used for many uses that have nothing to do with aviation, namely storage of automobiles, recreation vehicles, weekend housing, and mechanical work. These places were purchased because they were cheap as compared to buying commercial property in the County. Nowhere else in the County can you operate a facility that causes disturbance without any restrictions. The County shut down a racetrack because of noise on one day a week. How is it that there are no restrictions on the airport. Flight training groups operate 7 days a week 24 hours per day. Special events are conducted any time the airport wants, for example fly-in breakfasts, etc. Flight training should be allowed to operate like most businesses between the hours of 7am to 7pm.

When we were asked if we would mind if the High River Flying Club could start on this location because they had to move from the now AG Grounds our approval was based on it not developing into an airport with large planes and jets. Look what we have now.

Any development at the airport should be restricted to hangars and they should be sold at the same price industrial land is sold for in the County and taxed the same. Not subsidized by the taxpayers.

Most of the ideas that were listed were ridiculous. Again make the airport users pay not the taxpayers

We as taxpayers are not allowed intensive agriculture without County Council approval on agricultural land, why should an airport be allowed. We had three companies operating agricultural spray planes from the airport, they were asked to leave as the smell was annoying to the residents of the airport.

We have been operating our places since before the airport was started, in the DC5 area. Our closest neighbor has been a busy trucking company. The next neighbor operated a large landscaping company. Both these companies had more than 10 employees and made a lot of trips in and out. To the west of our place is a large storage company with again many trips in and out being made daily. As we were in the same DC5 zone it has always been our impression that we could have a business the same as our neighbors. At one time we did have a business operating on our property. Now you are saying that the new kid on the block can have all kinds of business but the long-time residents of the area cannot.

Regional Airport Land Use Project Survey and Feedback
From Delbert and Helen Edey.

You suggested that we won't be able to have windmills. I question why this is when there are numerous windmills within 4 km of the Pincher Creek airport and it is a bigger airport than High River as it handles firefighting planes. Vulcan has a large solar panel farm on the edge of the 4 km zone which is approved to become much bigger yet.

If you are going to take away our rights as property owners what kind of compensation are you proposing?

Our north properties we feel are ideally suited for light industrial zoning similar to the neighbors (Hifab Transport and Ken Nichols landscaping business) and what is being proposed at the airport.

The one thing I would like to bring forward that I haven't seen presented is that there is

NO WATER AT THE AIRPORT

All of the proposed businesses have no potable water available
No firefighting water.

The drainage that is currently in place is draining contaminate water into the Little Bow River
The airport group filled in a wetland for the development that is already there.

Dust and Smoke

The adjacent land to the north has already an approved gravel pit and asphalt plant.

Attracting Bird

The airport was built adjacent to the Little Bow River which is home to ducks, geese, Blue Herons, and swans along with other migratory birds. Why was the airport build adjacent to the Little Bow River if birds are a problem?????

Safety

The airport presentation is suggesting these changes are to protect the airport. We would like to question that we have never heard of the neighbors causing any kind of safety problem at the airport. On the other hand the airport causes all kinds of problems for the surrounding neighbors. There have been 2 plane crashes and one forced landing that we are aware of outside of the airport property on private land. There have also been plane wrecks on the airport lands. We have on a daily basis planes flying over our home with pilots that are just in the process of getting a pilot's licence. I believe there was a fatal accident at Springbank airport where the student and instructor were both killed.

We did hear of one complaint from the airport that combines in adjacent fields were causing dust.

On the positive side Steff Stephenson has been helpful in trying to work with airport businesses to lessen the harassment from the flight training groups. As there are many planes doing flight training touch and goes it is hard to identify where they are from. Many of these planes come from the north and don't have any consideration for the airport neighbours. They fly in and do 10 touch and goes and fly back north again. These are what the airport people call business flights.