

**From:** [Tracy Perri](#)  
**To:** [Public Hearings](#)  
**Cc:** [Carlo Perri](#)  
**Subject:** Land Description of Subject Parcel: NE 19-21-01 W5M  
**Date:** November 28, 2023 5:01:21 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Response to public hearing:

**Date:** December 6, 2023 at 11:00 AM

**Name:** Tracy and Carlo Perri

**Mailing Address:** [REDACTED]

**Email Address:** [REDACTED]

Good Afternoon,

I am writing in response to the Public hearing regarding parcel NE 19-21-01 W5M owned by David & Pricilla Unger proposing an Amendment to the Agricultural District land use rules to allow for the future subdivision of a one +/- 23.25 acre parcel.

This subdivision causes a concern for us in regards to water usage, extra vehicle traffic I am and migratory animal impact.

Firstly, since the movement of the mailboxes traffic on 266 has become unbearable. Walking on 266 is like walking along a street in Okotoks without the speed regulations. The noise is excessive especially during the agricultural months where bylaws are exempt. The added traffic also adds to the degradation of the road which was not intended for the level of traffic that uses it, sadly the county can not keep up with the current damage, how will they manage with an increase in traffic that could have been prevented?

With the development of the Equestrian center on 265, 266 and 80th in the summer are very steady with traffic. We moved to the rural foothills for the peace and quiet which is getting harder and harder to achieve, we should be able to walk along our roads with a sense of safety. Now the potential of another agricultural business (new owners of subdivision could add to the burden of traffic significantly depending on how they choose to develop it) further threatens our chosen way of living.

Secondly, water is a cherished commodity that we should not take lightly as once it is gone its gone. As everyone is aware the snow packs are not what they used to be leading to a further drain on water supplies, as the drought continues so does the demand on our water, further wells will add to this strain. The area in question is already heavily populated for a rural area, with each residence having their own wells utilizing the aquifer below ground. Once that water vein is used up, everyone around is taxed with either having to drill new wells and hope

that water is found, or have to convert to a cistern that requires water to be trucked in (trucking in water also adds to environmental pollution), all which are extremely expensive and could be avoided if we protect the valuable resource we have in our water.

Thirdly, the environmental impact that this subdivision could create, as the Elk herd uses this area as part of their migratory path. We should be protecting our land instead of dividing it up into smaller pieces, which I was under the impression that the Md of Foothills was against further degradation of land in order to protect agricultural land (grain, hay, canola and grazing land) as well as the species that call the area home.

In closing we are not in favor of this proposed subdivision for reasons of excessive traffic, potential harm to water source for ~14 homes and migratory animal impact. Please do not make this decision lightly as there are no second chances when it comes to our natural resources.

Sincerely,  
Tracy and Carlo Perri

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** This email has originated from outside of the Foothills County organization. Do not click on any links or open any attachments unless you recognize the sender's Name and Email address.