

November 25, 2022

Re: Permit 2D 207, Sea-Can for Personal Use (Douglas and Tena Taylor), Appeal Board Hearing  
November 29, 2022 1:00 pm

Regarding Permit 2D 207, Sea-Can for Personal Use, I have no issues whatsoever with the sea-can container or its installed location.

Brent and Tena have been our neighbours for the entire time that we have resided in Foothills County (20+ years). I can state that they have been absolutely wonderful neighbours. They are conscientious, helpful, and take care of others. They would never do anything to negatively impact others in their community.

On a scale of 1-100, I would rate the potential negative effects of the sea-can as 0.1. Although I am aware of the presence of the sea-can, it is situated well within the boundaries of the Tayler's property behind cover. It is essentially unnoticeable, even at this time of year with reduced foliage.

I can't help but note the irony present in this appeal. Over a period of many years, neighbours have had to endure the appellant's aggressive/uncontrolled dog. Over the past 3-4 years, neighbouring property owners have experienced significant risk from the appellant's burn piles that are non-compliant with County bylaws that are conditions attached to the issuing of burn permits. I have personally experienced burning embers falling on my property. I would rate the potential harm from these issues as 99.9 on a scale of 1-100.

Finally, I believe that it is important to recognize the fact that the Taylers have complied with the County's land bylaws in applying for a development permit related to the sea-can. I received a notification from Foothills County communicating the proposed development on October 12 2022. The Taylers have followed the rules properly.

In contrast, the following 'developments' are present on properties either adjoining my property, or in our subdivision:

- large pond/dugout (x 2 properties)
- large greenhouse structure and large detached garage out-building (appellant's property)
- inground swimming pool with accompanying change facility out-building

I do not recall having received notices from the County for any of these developments. It is possible that one or more of them are non-permitted.

In closing, I **support** the Tayler's proposed sea-can development.

Sincerely,

Don Scott

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]