



**LEDUC  
COUNTY**

What we heard

# Rural wedding and agricultural event facilities

Created: 01/25/2023

**Table of Contents**

Background ..... 3  
    Public participation ..... 3  
What we asked..... 3  
How we communicated ..... 4  
How you participated..... 5  
What you told us..... 5  
    Online comment form..... 5  
    Email submissions ..... 20  
    Phone submissions..... 79  
What we learned and what we’re doing ..... 80

## Background

Leduc County is currently reviewing the Land Use Bylaw and is considering making amendments with respect to rural wedding and agricultural event facilities.

This land use is defined within [Part 11 of the Land Use Bylaw](#) as follows:

*An indoor facility, accessory and incidental to the primary use that provides for an alternative of venue for events within a traditional rural setting, and is not intended to locate development that would be better located within defined business and commercial areas. Any use and/or development considered under this definition shall be designed to be agriculturally harmonious by way of design, appearance, scale and form and shall not detract from the rural and agricultural context of the site or its surroundings.*

*Uses may include, but are not limited to: weddings, meetings, seminars, farmers markets and trade fairs.*

This is listed as a discretionary use within the **AG – Agricultural** and **AG/CR TR – Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional** land use districts.

Within these two districts, the County is considering how these facilities are regulated, what amendments may be necessary to address concerns related to land-use compatibility with surrounding agricultural areas, and the future of such facilities in Leduc County.

### ***Public participation***

Input from the public will inform administration's recommendation to Council about how this use should be regulated and what, if any, amendments could be made to enhance land-use compatibility.

## What we asked

Between **Dec. 20 and Jan. 20**, we collected input from residents and landowners about the facilities, and any comments or concerns that they have with the use as it currently exists.

A page was created on the municipal website; the web page includes a project description, a link to the online comment form, and a link to a form for question submissions. Participants were asked to complete the comment form after reviewing the information on the page.

## How we communicated

# HOW WE COMMUNICATED

---

 **125** web page visits |  **383** letters mailed

 **9** print advertisements |  **6** social media posts

 **577** e-newsletter recipients

We promoted the opportunities for input in the following ways:

- ▶ **Direct-mailed letters:** we mailed 383 letters to landowners or residents who are currently operating a rural wedding and agricultural event facility, applicants with current development permit applications under review by Leduc County, and County residents and landowners residing in an area adjacent to one of these existing or proposed facilities.
- ▶ **Print advertisements:** we ran nine print advertisements in the Leduc Representative, County Market, Beaumont News, Devon Dispatch and Connect 39 newspapers promoting the opportunity to participate and directing readers to the project web page.
- ▶ **Public participation opportunities newsletter:** we sent four public participation opportunities email newsletters out to 577 subscribers.
- ▶ **Social media posts:** we posted six social media posts on Leduc County's Twitter and Facebook pages promoting the opportunity to participate and directing readers to the project web page.
- ▶ **Web page:** we provided full details on our project page, accessed via [leduccounty.com/public-participation](http://leduccounty.com/public-participation). The page included a project description, a link to the online comment form, and a link to a form for question submissions.

## How you participated

# HOW YOU PARTICIPATED



We heard from respondents in the following ways:

- ▶ **Online comment form:** we received 17 submissions through the online comment form on our website.
- ▶ **Emails:** we received 30 submissions via email.
- ▶ **Phone calls:** we received seven submissions via phone; as these responses are not able to be reported verbatim, the general discussion topic and sentiment has been summarized.
- ▶ **Social media engagements:** we received 199 clicks, reactions, comments and shares.

## What you told us

A total of **54 participants** submitted input on rural wedding and agricultural event facilities.

### *Online comment form*

Between Dec. 20 and Jan. 20, we received input from **17 respondents** via the online submission form.

The following are verbatim submissions and a summary of the response provided. It should be noted that not all participants provided contact information to receive a direct response.

Comment ( <i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i> )	Response
I feel this facility is totally unnecessary as in the general area we have New Sarepta Agriplex, Rollyview Hall and the Hall just east of HW 21 and they are being utilized fully so I feel another of these type of buildings is not needed at this time.	<i>Thank you for your feedback.</i>

<p>I live in a nearby neighborhood where this is located. I have read the letters that have come over the last couple of years regarding this facility including the recent case that the owner took to a higher level. That's when I became quite concerned about what is happening in my neighborhood. It doesn't sound like this facility is abiding by the present rules and on one occasion caused an animal on an adjacent property to become terrified enough that it hurt itself seriously when trying to escape what it perceived as a threat. In my opinion, the operations at this facility have moved from nuisance to dangerous and even trampling on adjacent property owners' rights to peace on their own properties. Perhaps this owner would be happy to pay affected neighbor's taxes?</p> <p>In addition, every few months we receive a letter about this facility, which is good as we need to be informed and I'm glad we are; however, it seems our county resources are somewhat strained by the constant attention that is require to babysit these operations. This owner does not respect anyone else or how the actions, decisions and activities affect people who live here. I hope Leduc County is empowered to deal with this issue for county residents.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for your participation.</i></p>
<p>I think that we should encourage these facilities where possible. It is incumbent to find solutions instead of roadblocks.</p> <p>Most Objections -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic - not a valid objection. The roads are meant to be used for economic development. It is not OK for grain trucks or oil tanker trucks to travel on the roads and not allow passenger vehicles heading to an event. Dust control may need to be considered.</li> <li>2. Noise - this concern is valid but needs to be reasonable. How much noise, time of day, how often, is the event inside or out? What is a reasonable distance, maybe something like 200 meters. Install sound barriers?</li> </ol>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we have heard your comments and appreciate your time.</i></p>

<p>I think there are plenty of rural community halls that can fit small weddings, markets, and meetings. Facilitating under 100 people or so. . Usually have great parking and spots for camping as well in a rural treed setting. Any venues larger than that should be carefully considered by the county before any permits are passed. Especially listing to surrounding neighbour's thoughts and concerns.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback.</i></p>
<p>Don't have a problem with that [as long] as its a one-time deal not run as a business.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback.</i></p>
<p>We have several halls in the county that seem to be under-utilized. I'm not sure we need another facility. I believe the legion hall sits idle a lot as well. Thank you.</p>	<p><i>Your input is appreciated, thanks for participating.</i></p>
<p>As an adjacent land owner, resident to an Event facility that is developing individual permit by individual permit the size of the facility is difficult to gauge and uncertain it terms of impact on our quality of life. I have provided feedback, responded to development permits and expressed in writing and in conversation with our area counsellor, spoken to the development individual that provided the permits and people in development my concern is that the scope of this facility is completely unknown and therefor it is really hard to predetermine it's impact.</p> <p>We visited the site and they expressed a grand plan and in speaking to development because they are asking for one development permit at a time for individual building or small development, development department express that individual permits do not raise concern and the permits are not looked at or evaluated cumulatively. That is correct a shed does not raise concern, a greenhouse does not raise concern, geodesic domes don't raise a concern plus the event facility and the accessory and incidental individually don't raise individual concern but in an undetermined duration of development time each approved permit collectively will have a gross impact on the</p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we have heard your comments and appreciate your time.</i></p>

<p>quality of our residence and quality of experience in our back yard and satisfaction of living in rural Leduc County. Once in full operation an increase in traffic, noise and light pollution will collectively be a concern.</p> <p>To date the facility does not seem to be approved to operate. Only on a few occasions have I heard music coming from the facility but when this place opens up in entirety it would be hard not to estimate that noise, light pollution (already have a standing light for a skating rink) and traffic impact is surely predictable. There are numerous Hops poles that one could assume would lead one to believe the future of a distillery might be in consideration. We have not received permits for these numerous Hops poles that significantly change the land scape out side their treed area.</p> <p>I'd like to see such a facility being required to submit a conclusive development plan. An area scope and sequence of development, a kind of business, development plan. Then items above and beyond that plan they could request permits. They understand small permit request are working because larger request for multiple facilities were denied. Permits were issue after structure we're built. Numerous permits are being requested that as a resident I have to [respond] to and that is fatiguing. I have no just cause to object to a individual permit because little or no impact is yet to affect us but when this facility opens in entirety we will have no recourse, as conditional permits of 2 years will become permanent and they have asked for exception to conditional because of [COVID-19] restrictions but have yet to prove they will not have a negative impact on my adjacent residence. I reiterate I would like to see such facility have to have a full area scope and sequence of development and not be granted more until they prove what exists can operate within guidelines.</p>	
<p>Have no concern at this point</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback.</i></p>

My feedback is collected and presented from a combination of potential problems that can arise when located near a venue in general to actual problems encountered as we have actually owned the property directly attached on 2 sides to an unapproved outdoor wedding venue that went on for a year until we were finally able to have them investigated and shut down. My apologies for the lengthy feedback as we wanted to provide some examples as well.

Firstly, the definition of wedding venues should not be limited to just weddings, they will have any kind of event that is willing to book and pay for their services. Venues should also not be defined as an indoor event only, there are outdoor venues as well which would generate even more noise and a plethora of other possible problems including trespassing onto surrounding areas, risk of fire (as they rented out their firepit area) as well as smoking, fireworks, enhanced noise from speakers and microphones as the noise is no longer contained within 4 walls, outdoor fighting and abusive behavior, etc. In our case, the owners also bragged they hosted a "come check us out" for free(?) party for the police/RCMP. This was of concern for 2 reasons.

One, they were trying to make friendly contacts on the police force in order for favoritism / grace to be shown down the road if it was a free party. Two, if they were actually hired and paid to host the party by the RCMP, why did the RCMP not question where a business license was and what limits on capacity were in place for fire reasons. The owners also hosted a neighborhood get together, fun BBQ, for, in hindsight, possibly some of the same reasons of befriending the neighbors. They sent out invitations with wine and beer to only a select few of the closest neighbors (although there are 2 subdivisions on either side of them, only a select few closely located ones from each were invited) saying they were new to the area and wanted to meet their neighbors. They paid for all the liquor and food, showed the outdoor tent they purchased for a

*Thank you for participating, we have heard your comments and appreciate your time.*

"family wedding" and newly built 4 enclosed outdoor washrooms with full plumbing for their family wedding.

They said no one could see the inside of their older farmhouse as they were fixing it up. Meanwhile, we find out later it was fully renovated and operating as an Airbnb already and bridal house and they were living in their shop. Full pics of the inside were on their websites. There was no signage on the property indicating anything other than a private residence.

We live within a mile of an environmental and wildlife area, Ministik Bird Sanctuary. Outdoor unpermitted bathrooms were built, so there was a concern environmentally when 200-400 guests are using these facilities, and potentially up to 7 days a week. The house operated as a Bridal space and Airbnb, which also is potentially 365 days a year.

Possibility of increased risk of thefts/crime to the area, especially if guests can just walk across the field to my yard during the middle of the night and possibly while they are under the influence and confrontational. How do I protect or secure my property without becoming a full-time vigilante? The drinking not only increases possibility of thefts to the area, but drunk driving, stunting, pollution, fighting, abusive and disrespectful behavior. Recommend venues need dedicated transportation as there are no Ubers rurally to call for guests who may require one.

People like to walk down the side of the road for exercise, social aspect or walking pets. We do not have sidewalks in rural areas and this increases the risk of accidents as stunting and drunk driving is a possibility both during the day after the ceremony as well as the evening reception.

Recommend venues should not be operated on a 7 day basis, max 1-2 days per week, restricted to

commercial development areas with an acceptable and researched minimum barrier of "dead" space between to any residential areas.

In our case, the owners were also a photography business and were going onto my property without permission for photo shoots on the beautiful canola fields and at one point cut down the trees along one approach (most likely to increase the beauty of a photography session) then called us to beg forgiveness that they didn't know where the property line was. After contacting a survey company to mark out the property lines, I had coincidentally called the same one who they had hired 6 months previously, so, in fact, they were more than aware where the property lines were. This adds a lot of animosity to neighboring relationships.

Decreased property values and the inability to resell a property near a venue. We were in the process of purchasing the property from our family when we found out that weddings were happening and seriously considered withdrawing the paperwork from the lawyer as we didn't know how long the process to shut them down would take, and if we would even be able to. I can't image a farming operation who is set up with outbuildings and livestock, being able to move away from that setup easily. And reselling would be almost impossible.

Very few, if any, people would consciously choose to purchase a property located next to a wedding venue. We already have had to fight Atco and the issue of powerlines going past our property and thankfully were successful, however, the residences they did end up going past, have had their properties devalued and the power posts were much larger than Atco initially led us to believe.

Decibel levels to be adhered to. We have family members that work shift work from home of 4 days on, 4 days off and their 12 hour shifts obviously can go through the weekends. Having

the noise keep them up at night, especially in the summer when windows are open during the night, causes stress when they have a 5 am shift starting in the morning.

County advised us that only the adjacent neighbors need to be notified of a business requesting licences to open and operate. There are 2 subdivisions with 45 other families that were within half a mile of this venue and weren't going to have the opportunity to give their input. People within a 1 or 2 mile radius should have a vote, not just adjacent neighbors.

Not fully able to enjoy my own guests or solitude while always competing with speakers and music/bands. We actually had issues with my own pets being attacked by wildlife and could not hear their distress over the music. Obviously, this can happen during the occasional gathering hosted by neighbors too, but the risk is far smaller and not consistently every day or weekend (as in our case, they advertised they will do a wedding any day of the week /365 days of the year).

No venues should be approved near reserves, wildlife corridors and water areas, subdivisions or other dense populations, and definitely fireworks should be prohibited. There are many studies that show the distress it causes animals, including self-harm. What are their rights to a peaceful existence, and if I don't vote on their behalf, who else is taking up this cause?

Dilemma: during one unauthorized wedding and upon complaining to the county, the county advised they can't do anything to immediately stop a wedding, they will just process the action in a formal manner administratively and for me to contact Bylaw if there is a problem. Bylaw said they don't come out 24/7 and won't come out due to noise complaints anyway and to call the RCMP. Upon contacting the RCMP during the day, they said I cannot phone them before a wedding starts, and then upon making the call

again after the wedding proceeded, said they won't break up a wedding while it's ongoing and it needs to be enforced by the County, however, were willing to document the noise complaint.

There was no one willing to help with the issue short term. That is unacceptable and dismissive of my rights to a peaceful existence. In addition to having people walking on my property, I cannot or should not have to monitor that 24/7. This causes upset neighbors to feel they have to take matters into their own hands and approach the venue during an event to voice their complaints causing the potential for escalated behaviors.

This happened in our case to neighbors who approached the venue to complain and the venue owners started adding "security people" down their driveways to deter anyone getting to the party, causing frustration that the RCMP won't show up even when asked.

Operating a vacation rental / Airbnb. This is a bit off topic for some venues, however, was a concern we came across since the venue by us did (and still may) operate an Airbnb from the same location, renting their house to Bridal parties and wedding guests. This increases the possibility of guests themselves having their own unauthorized parties and not respect any decibel rules and capacity limits. Who will control that? I couldn't get the RCMP to show up for a wedding, how about an out-of-control party. Will I be told to contact the county on "Monday " again?

Lastly, are my rights to a peaceful existence. That is literally the reason why we chose the country life away from commercial developments, have livestock and pets that shouldn't live under the added stress until late into the night, can listen to the frogs in the evening on my deck, watch the wildlife, and enjoy my space the way I want respectfully while not imposing on my neighbors' rights.

As a County resident who is residing in an area near one of these existing or proposed facilities, I have several concerns and questions:

Capability with surrounding agricultural areas:

Agricultural necessities must be balanced with events held at these facilities when they are in close proximity to one another, such as combine/cultivation dust, manure application, etc. occurring during events.

Rural agriculture was here long before these venues, and is the second largest industry in Leduc County. It is important that we treat it as what it is; the most valuable asset.

Complaints from facility owners/guests:

What happens when there is a wedding at an approved venue (paying \$11,000 in rental fees) and the (newly approved) dairy expansion is spreading liquid manure on the same day? Conversely, what happen if there are many complaints from surrounding rural residents about excessive noise from a wedding at a facility? If there are no clearly outlined rights, there will be issues between neighbouring operations.

Traffic:

The amount of traffic arriving to and exiting from these facilities must be considered. There may be 150+ guests in-transit at one time, to and from the venues onto busy highways without controlled intersections or traffic lights. This is a safety issue.

Regulation and Enforcement:

I have noticed that information published on one facility's website does not match the conditions stated in the Approved Development notice supplied by Leduc County.

*We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for your participation.*

<p>Thank you for considering feedback from residents. I look forward to further communication regarding the issues above.</p>	
<p>I like the idea of Rural Weddings as long as it does [not] take away from Community Halls</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback, we appreciate your time.</i></p>
<p>I would like to submit that there is no added benefit to adding public event facilities to the rural communities. Surrounding residences and businesses have and will be negatively affected from the negative aspects of functions such as: additional traffic, possible trespass on private land, litter/refuse, potential impaired public that may operate vehicles, increased fire hazard from vehicles and people smoking or using fireworks, added environmental pollution from roads such as dust and noise and also importantly can result in a delay to emergency services due to additional traffic.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to send in my opinions.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to participate. Your feedback is appreciated.</i></p>
<p>Specifically relating to rural wedding event facilities:</p> <p>Must be secondary to a principal dwelling  Cannot be in addition to any other discretionary use on the property  Do not allow on a parcel less than 80 acres  Do not allow overnight guests  Do not allow weekday events  Restrict noise from site - hours, decibels  Restrict number of guests and vehicles  Limit size and number of accessory buildings</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for your participation.</i></p>
<p>As landowners in the adjacent area to the proposed Wedding and Event venue we have the following concerns:</p> <p>-the influx of unknown people and vehicles invading this area. With such an increase of people, it seems statistically that there could be more risk of criminal activity.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to participate. Your feedback is appreciated.</i></p>

<p>-concerns that there would not be an increase in policing and monitoring during the times when these events occur.</p> <p>-with the increase of traffic on those roads, it poses difficulties when we are moving equipment to complete farming tasks</p> <p>-the increased noise during these events poses a threat to the peace and quiet we enjoy.</p> <p>-risk of increased impaired driving on the roads during these events. There is always alcohol at these kind of events and there is no assurance that precautions would be taken to prevent impaired driving.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to review our concerns!</p>	
<p>I am writing in regard to the Land Use Bylaw 7-08 amendment for Rural Wedding and Agricultural Events Centers. We do not see any benefit to having these event centers in our rural communities. Instead, they cause problems for surrounding farms and properties. Neighbours have been affected by noise distributions, trespassing, extra traffic, drunk drivers, dust, garbage, increased first hazards and emergency services delays. All of the aforementioned problems can be avoided by not allowing such centers in our communities. We live in our community for the peace, quiet and space it affords us and most importantly, wanting to keep everyone safe.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for your participation.</i></p>
<p>I wish to provide the following comments in response to your request for feedback regarding potential amendments to the Land Use Bylaw with respect to rural wedding and agricultural event facilities.</p> <p>After reviewing the purpose of the review, I had to ask myself why this part of the Bylaw requires an amendment. Being aware there are facilities in the rural area that can and do host a number</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your participation. We appreciate your feedback.</i></p>

of private and public events, I have to assume this review pertains to those events not held in a public facility. Since it is unlikely meetings, seminars, farmers markets and trade fairs will be held on private property, it appears weddings may be one of the few uses that are not addressed adequately. If this is the case, then it might be a good idea to separate this use from the others under the current definition and address it separately. In this process, I would like to clarify where “farm to table” events might fall since they do not appear to be included under the definition at all.

According to the Municipal Development Plan, it is pretty clear that the purpose of policies that apply generally to all of the rural area and specifically to the Agricultural Districts is meant to ensure the rural character is maintained and valuable agricultural lands are conserved. In fact, the very first policy, 4.3.0.1, states that agricultural uses **shall take precedence** within the agricultural areas. Of the four agricultural areas identified, East, North Central, South Central/East and Smallholding, the policy statements outline the purpose and intent of each area and in order to conserve large tracts of land and limit incompatible land uses, subdivisions have been limited. The MDP goes on to say that subdivisions in the agricultural areas be **shall be** limited to 2-4 titled lots per quarter section depending on the specific area identified which could be viewed as unfairly impinging of the rights of property owners.

It is interesting to note that the MDP does not specify a minimum parcel size while the Land Use Bylaw indicates new residential lots in the AG district shall be between 2.5 and 4.9 acres.

Many subdivisions resulting in the formation of small parcels have occurred over the years and the practice may or may not continue into the future. Why is this a concern? Because there has been no requirement to rezone small parcels in the AG district, no matter the size.

And this is where my concerns begin.

Even though the purpose of the AG district is to provide primarily for agricultural operations, the list of permitted or discretionary uses in the bylaw goes well beyond any only having a secondary role to agriculture. This means that a parcel in the AG district, even if it is less than 3 acres, is zoned AG. The question to ask is - did the Land Use Bylaw intend all permitted uses be allowed without question and all discretionary uses considered without regard to parcel size? In other words under the current wording, the same uses, many of which are commercial in nature, could be approved for a 3-acre parcel as they could be for a 160-acre parcel. With no limit to site coverage, no maximum size of an accessory building and no limit to the total number of buildings allowed, I feel this only compounds the issue and opens the door to all types of inappropriate development on small parcels even though they legitimately exist as a result of subdivision. If that development is a business, including one that is home-based and somehow interpreted to include a wedding event, it shouldn't surprise anyone that conflict between neighbouring landowners will arise.

Under the current bylaw, a permitted use shall be approved and a discretionary use may be approved if either comply with the bylaw, however both are silent on parcel size for most uses.

Although there is a requirement to consider function, form and scale when reviewing a development permit application, there seems to be a fair bit of discretion in the application of this criteria even though the development **shall not** detract from the rural and agricultural context of the site or its surroundings according the Land Use Bylaw. It also states that adjacent landowners must be notified and anyone else who could be affected may or may not be notified as well. In my opinion, it appears this

discretion does not appear to be applied consistently or fairly and the influence of opinions from adjacent landowners in support or opposition to a development for the most part is unknown.

To get back to the question about rural wedding and agricultural event facilities, I looked at what needs to be considered?

While the definition is fairly broad to include as many activities as possible, the impact of such facilities cannot be ignored, however there is significant differences between a wedding, a seminar and a trade fair, including the size of parcel and services required to accommodate such an event.

Even if it makes sense to locate wedding and agricultural event facilities on private property in the rural area, these businesses, just like any other commercial venture, must be viewed through the eyes of the neighboring landowners. Even if we are to assume the review is to address the needs of wedding events primarily, then the discussion must include how many attendees and vehicles will be allowed on site and in the buildings, parking requirements, noise attenuation, impacts on roadways, washroom facilities and requests for overnight stays. There are a number of things that anyone can find annoying about a business and even if approval is subject to a number of conditions that are intended to address any negative impact, who it is that is responsible to monitor, report and enforce compliance remains unanswered.

Rural landowners, particularly those that have chosen to farm, contribute significantly to the diversity and economic development of Leduc County. They have made significant investments in their properties and have as much right to protect their place of business as any other commercial venture. I'm sure anyone who is engaged in an agricultural activity does not consider their land "simply as a holding reserve for development but as a valuable resource that

<p>needs to be protected for future generations”. If Leduc County truly champions the importance of agriculture and is committed to ensuring its long-term viability, then any development that would be better located within defined business and commercial areas should be limited in the rural area. If not, then the County, as policy makers, ought to be asking whose interests should take precedent?</p> <p>As part of the Land Use Bylaw Review currently underway, I am expecting the feedback the public is providing will be included in the process along with other key areas that were identified as project priorities before final approval of the Bylaw.</p>	
<p>I believe that events like this should be reviewed on an individual or single event basis. All aspects still need to be reviewed including rights and concerns from all surrounding land owners and residents that may be affected by this event. There are a lot or venues in communities that are not being utilized.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for participating.</i></p>

**Email submissions**

Between Dec. 20 and Jan. 20, we received input from **30 respondents** via email. The following are verbatim submissions and a summary of the response provided.

*Only comments containing **input** on the topic are reflected below; questions are documented and answered outside of the public participation process.*

Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response
<p>Let people get married where they want!!</p> <p>Far too many rules and policies and regulations and procedures and interventions to our lives.</p> <p>We don't want communism. Let people run their own lives and their own businesses, please.</p>	<p><i>Your input is appreciated, thank you for participating.</i></p>
<p>I have received yet another letter from Leduc County in regards to commercial based development in our backyards.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for your participation.</i></p>

I do have some concerns as this latest letter dated Dec 21, 2022 and released by [Leduc County] is vague and fairly loose in development content.

As the County is very well aware, we are in disagreement with the wedding venue which is in our backyards and do not want this type of development destroying our homelife, disturbing our farming operations and stressing our livestock and ruining the natural wildlife habitat.

We have been battling these developments for the last few years and the fact that Leduc County, it's planning and Development department has total disregard for the residents who do live here, pay their taxes and want a quiet lifestyle are clearly not being heard or respected.

In regards to the Title of this letter, "Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facilities " simply adding to the name to include Agricultural aspects of our community does not by any means make a facility an agricultural event unless it is a designated building or grounds for Agricultural events. This means it is NOT a multi use venue.

My response to this letter is straight forward. Do not proceed with these types of developments in our back yards and to further expand let me ask this one question that holds a substantial amount of weight. If this was to be developed right beside my property, how would it impact my life and those around me and my neighbors?

In closing, residents located on TWP 504 DO NOT WANT THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT and want the County to respect this. I know the White Wood Barn Wedding Venue has destroyed the community connection because of total disregard to near by residents and we don't want this. The Aspen Events off of TWP 504 RR225 is having the same effect and do not want their permits renewed as they continue to display un

<p>repairable trust in our community. Please research the letters of opposition in regards to this.</p> <p>If Leduc County feels the need for these types of destructive venues, it should supply County owned property for development, and if encroachment of private property or disruption to current land use is impacted by such developments, compensation should be awarded to existing property owners on an annual basis.</p> <p>Please take this information and really listen to what the people are indicating.</p>	
<p>In response to the request in the letter dated December 21, 2022 from [Leduc County], first we want to thank Leduc County Planning and Development for the opportunity to provide input.</p> <p>While Planning and Development may be seeking input on the existing bylaw, we need to ask the fundamental question about whether there is a need for new rural wedding and agricultural event facilities in agricultural/country residential transitional land use districts?</p> <p>The county already has a number of community halls, which would seem to be better suited. There is also a facility like The Old Red Barn that would seem suitable as it is located on a paved road and the neighbours are already aware of it.</p> <p>The same comment for the Leduc West Antique Society site, except it is not on a paved road, but is only 1/2 mile from Highway 39.</p> <p>Siting a new rural wedding and agricultural event facility in an agricultural area presents a number of challenges for both the operator and the neighbours, as there will be dust from gravel roads, dust from field work and encountering large, agricultural machines moving down the roads.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback. Thank you for participating.</i></p>

There are also potential problems with noise coming from an event, if there are residences in close proximity to the rural wedding and agricultural event facility. Noise and dust are two problems that are particularly difficult to mitigate.

Also, if residences are in close proximity to the rural wedding and agricultural event facility, there are concerns about trespassing on neighbours' property, as property lines are not necessarily apparent.

There are also concerns about increased risk of fire to neighbouring properties when it is dry and/or windy. The length of time it takes for the fire department to locate a rural property, travel to it and have enough water to deal with a fire, are all factors that are exacerbated in a rural setting.

Recognizing that this is a discretionary use, the bylaw already states that it is not intended to locate development that would be better located within defined business and commercial areas.

It is difficult to imagine a location for a rural wedding and agricultural event facility that would not have some or all of the problems set out above and where it would not be better to have the event in a community hall or similar existing rural venue. Therefore, the bylaw would appear to be unnecessary. If the bylaw is left in effect and Leduc County tries to rely on placing conditions to mitigate dust and/or noise on approvals of development applications of new rural wedding and agricultural event facilities, the conditions are difficult to monitor and enforce and unlikely to be effective.

For these reasons, again, our recommendation is for the bylaw to be rescinded.

As residents of the South Vistas, we are adjacent to the current wedding facility located just to the east of us at NE-20-50-24-4 – Tangle Roots.

We believe the best way to share our input is to again reference the following applications from that facility throughout the years beginning January 2020, our concerns and frustrations throughout these past three years. Application #'s D20-002; D20-212; D21-297; D22-050; D22-086.

We have over these past few years expressed frustration in various aspects of this facility in trying to determine where they are going with the development. It is way beyond a wedding facility in its original application and to be honest over the past three years, there have been very, very few weddings.

We expressed that we were not against business development overall nor were we fundamentally opposed to the original concept of a Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility. We were and continue to be very concerned with a number of issues in relation to the overall number of subsequent applications and approval processes (various and differing from the original application) we have encountered in the past three years.

A summary of our frustrations:

**Original application D20-002** dated January 3, 2020 requested the following:

- An event facility to host weddings, meetings, seminars, markets, reunions, overnight camping, skating rink and food trailer
- Varying hours and days till 2:00 am (Wednesday thru Sunday)
- Total of five employees
- Four staff vehicles and approximately 50 vehicles per event plus overnight camping units

We did not fundamentally oppose the facility but we did oppose some hours of operation till 2:00

*Thank you for your feedback, and for participating.*

am and overnight camping, citing our various reasons which the county has on file.

What was approved: (shortlisted to present our case)

- Wednesday and Thursday 10 am to midnight; Friday and Saturday 10 am to 2 am.
- No overnight camping or skating rink associated with the facility
- No more than 50 guest vehicles; no more than 200 guests at any given time
- Outdoor storage prohibited

**Application D20-212** dated October 30, 2020 requested the following:

(this application was only 10 months later)

- Four shipping containers
- Two outdoor gathering areas
- Expanded days and hours 6 am to 2 am Monday to Sunday
- Overnight accommodation
- Vehicles 100 per day/ 500 per week

Again we opposed the hours of operation and overnight camping, citing previously expressed concerns the County have on file.

What was approved: (shortlisted to present our case)

- No overnight accommodation (all guests must vacate the premises following closure of event)
- Days and hours now expanded Sunday thru Wednesday 6 am to 10 pm; Thursday thru Saturday 6 am to 2 am
- Outdoor storage prohibited
- No more than 75 guest passenger vehicles on site at any given time
- No more than 200 guests on the property at any given time or occupancy load max, whichever is less. ***We point this out as an increase in guests was not in the application. They also recently had***

***a graduation event that surpassed this, and most likely the occupancy load max.***

**Application D21-297** dated October 18, 2021 requested the following:

- Earth Berm extending west along #625 to attenuate sound, wind and sight

We opposed this for various reasons. We also brought to the attention of the Development Office Alberta Transportations plan to twin #625 where they wanted to put the berm. The Development Officer was not aware of this - much to our surprise. You have our other concerns in opposition on file.

This application was denied.

**Application** dated May 2022 to host Graduation activities for the City of Beaumont. Application was to exceed the numbers of vehicles and guests.

This was approved.

**Application D22-050** dated May 18, 2022 requesting the following:

- Campground with four geodesic vinyl dome tents
- 24 hours / 7 days a week
- Four vehicles on a weekly basis
- Two employees working the campground

We also opposed this, but also felt previous denials re: no overnight camping and all guests must vacate the property would apply and there would be an automatic denial.

We were shocked and disgusted when this was approved: (shortlisted to present our case)

- Four geodesic domes were approved. ***(They were already built prior to the application).***
- ***Campground now available 24/7***
- Two employees

- Client visits limited to four vehicle trips per week. (*First time reference to 'client' is introduced in all applications. Another business in mind?*)

**Application D22-086** dated May 18, 2022 requesting the following:

- Commercial greenhouse
- 11 am to 9 pm seven days a week
- 100 vehicles on a weekly basis
- Two employees

What was approved: (shortlisted to present our case)

- Commercial greenhouse
- Two employees
- 11 am to 9 pm seven days a week
- 100 vehicles per week

**One can quickly see by the varying applications above the confusion and frustration we are experiencing. The continuous and sporadic permit requests and inconsistent development processes that deviate from or are inconsistent with the original permit application for a Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility does not provide a comprehensive overall vision of the property nor the applicants overall intentions.**

**Major concerns are:**

- Individual permits and some elements within each permit application may appear reasonable, but collectively result in inappropriate size, usage and purpose related to the original application.
- ***Rejection of some requests in earlier applications (hours of operation, no overnight camping, guests vacating the premises after each event, total vehicles etc) is reworked into another type of permit and now approved – all going back to the original permit requests. What has changed today that was not allowed three years ago?***

- Affected land owners should not have had to respond on average twice a year to different permit applications for a venue that does not have a vision or apparent end goal.
- Multiple permits requests with short response timelines was fatiguing and frustrating for us. We were away and not aware of the application. We felt like 'giving up'. Our concerns with the multiple and various requests not associated to the original Wedding Facility application were for the most part totally ignored.
  - o Two strong points here – hours of operation substantially changed in less than two years for no valid reasoning and overnight camping (all guests must vacate the property after the event is completed) was a complete 180 degree reversal.
  - o Two substantial applications - the geodesic domes and greenhouse applications were turned around in two weeks while some adjoining residents were away and had no chance to respond. Are we to then understand that if we don't respond it means we approve, when in fact the overnight camping was denied twice before and no valid argument was presented to change prior decisions.
- Work was completed before permits were requested or approved for the fully furnished geodesic domes, and all groundwork including pathways, decking, lighting, saunas were fully

developed prior to the permit and approval process.

- The greenhouse was already erect prior to the permit and approval process as well. One must also bring forward the question of heating and electrical permits prior to building permits? As a homeowner, when we renovated our home we had to have a permit in place before heating and electrical permits applied for? How did they get around this?
- Currently there are three berms that are intended to create a pond, lazy river, summer and winter fishing and or a skating pond with lighting. No permit applications have yet been received. Is a potential skating 'pond' different than a skating 'rink' that was denied?
- This past year another berm is being created – no permits or notice to the adjoining landowners.
- We are of the understanding they want to bring in two sea containers to expand the greenhouse.
- They currently have, and continue to erect a number of hop poles intending to grow hops. It leads one to think perhaps a brewhouse in future plans?
- If a condition of noise is a consideration (Item 10 of D20-002), during the permitted grad event held June 25, music could be heard by the adjacent landowners. As the County currently does not have a noise bylaw, we have no enforcement avenue to pursue.

The original application approvals:

- five employees
- four staff vehicles
- 50 vehicles per event
- maximum of 200 guests at any given time

- four days a week with varying hours no later than midnight
- no camping nor overnight stays
- no skating rink

It is now:

- seven days a week, 24 hours/day till 2 am (overnight camping now allowed)
- We have no idea how many employees now
- 75 guest vehicles per event plus 100 vehicles per week for the greenhouse
- Camping in geodesic domes meaning overnight stays
- With an operational greenhouse and allowable guest vehicles, and perhaps a wedding on a Saturday, just how many vehicles and guests are allowed?

Reliable sources have told us they have plans for more overnight accommodation, a spa and expansion west of the current facilities towards the East Kayda Vista acreages (the adjacent landowners).

We believe the County does not reference previous applications for adjacent landowner concerns. We seriously question this as the first two applications where overnight accommodations were denied and then later approved. Why?

We are concerned and wish to know who makes the final decision regarding approval or denial of all aspects of an application. One person? Joint Planning and Development decision? We are aware we have an appeal process we can pursue, but when we have lost complete confidence in the application and subsequent approval processes that go beyond reasonable grounds and common sense it's hard to have faith in an appeal process.

Each time they wish to host an event to circumvent allowable guest and vehicle

maximums will they make continuous applications and we have to respond each time? (ie: the graduation event)?

We believe the overall intent of the landowner's plans and applications were not done in good faith. This did not foster good neighbor relationships. To mitigate the permit development request(s) and the inconsistencies, some during holiday seasons with short duration responses, we respectfully requested a comprehensive and all-encompassing development plan. This would promote a fully transparent relationship between the applicants and the adjacent landowners with a clear understanding of what we are approving or opposing.

As a community we have repeatedly expressed concerns with the gaps in process and communication with our county representative in regards to development within our area. He was not made aware of development applications and resulting dissatisfaction until we brought it to his attention. This resulted in a negative and reactive dynamic with all stakeholders which was counterproductive and frustrating. When Leduc County is not holding to their previous decisions this then leads to frustration, mistrust and divisiveness.

We also sought a clearer understanding of the common phrasing in every development decision regarding . . . 'two year conditional permit approval, and on or before two years from the effective date operations (varying) shall cease unless a new development permit allowing for this Use is issued. We have not received any such applications renewals (now three years) from the first application and strongly believe they have breached conditions numerous times.

Are the facilities inspected to ensure compliance?

<p>We ask Leduc County in your request for public input to hear our concerns regarding our frustration with this facility over the past three years. Hopefully this will help you with your amendments. The current bylaw is much too broad, leaving the developer great flexibility to do whatever they want and adjacent landowners little ground to object.</p>	
<p>As an acreage owner located near an unpermitted wedding venue (Olive Garden) we have a number of concerns. We moved to an acreage to enjoy a country living style in a quiet rural community some 30 years ago. A recently constructed wedding venue has severely disrupted our lives, and the environment around us. We have the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We were never consulted regarding this commercial development. When we entered the premises (Olive Garden) last summer to investigate the source of this loud party noise every weekend, we were told that it was to accommodate relatives. Since then we have discovered a commercial wedding venue website offering various wedding packages at this location.</li> <li>2. Every weekend in the summer there has been loud party noise with speakers and announcers. The noise goes through to our backyard in the late afternoon and continuously into the night. It penetrates (about a quarter mile) through the woods and into our house, through bedroom windows at night. This disturbs not only us, but our visiting family and guests. We were told that there would be new speakers installed when we entered the venue (above), but if so, there has been no sound reduction.</li> <li>3. We have serious concerns about drunk drivers on the road near the venue at night. We avoid driving near there at night.</li> <li>4. We are part of the Beaver Hills ecosystem which has water drainage into Ministic Lake. The</li> </ol>	<p><i>We appreciate your input, thank you for your time.</i></p>

<p>Olive Garden venue is located less than a mile from the Ministic Lake Bird Sanctuary. Having 100 people running water and flushing toilets (I understand 4 toilets have been installed) will have a detrimental impact on the water system, especially if there is any malfunction in the septic system.</p> <p>I strongly suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any present commercial wedding venue located within a mile of any rural residence be deemed illegal and closed.</li> <li>2. Any commercial wedding venue not be allowed to be developed within a mile of any rural residence, unless the land is zoned for commercial development.</li> <li>3. A mile wide buffer zone be created around Ministic Lake Bird Sanctuary border in Leduc County be created, in which no commercial development be allowed aside from agricultural land use.</li> </ol> <p>I greatly appreciate your reading this and hopefully acting on our suggestions.</p>	
<p>In response to your recent letter regarding rural Wedding venues. We have been presently dealing with a neighboring issue relating to this review.</p> <p>I have on several occasions, either by attending or submitting letters regarding why we feel that this is not a good use of farm land</p> <p>This idea disrupts the use of viable farm land, as well as causing problems with strangers constantly in our area. I had pointed out in one of my letters that when we first moved to the country from the city back in 1992, it was not necessary to even lock your doors, now as you look around everyone seems to be getting gates, security systems, and locked doors. This is because of the unwanted traffic that this change in land use has caused. People that don't live out here tend to not respect each other's property. It's a burden on our already in much</p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we will take your comments into consideration.</i></p>

<p>need of roads and use of the police service. Not least of all, the rise in thefts.</p> <p>By taking away much needed farm land you are forcing farmers to seek land further and further away from their homes.</p> <p>Please take this into consideration when you are reviewing this use of land. We are totally against these redevelopments.</p>	
<p>Yes. I have no concerns as long as the land and facility areas are respected.</p> <p>I have participated in dinner cookout functions where a chef has prepared meals in a farmer's field location using locally grown food. Made in Alberta.</p>	<p><i>Great, thanks for your input!</i></p>
<p>I have no concerns over any activities that provides financial returns for our citizens, and doesn't impact the neighbors (ie don't allow more stinky activities that denigrate our enjoyment of our properties). Weddings and agricultural events are only a couple of reasonable ideas!</p> <p>Let's also consider income generating ideas like birding, or B&amp;B's and let the additional sleeping quarters have "cooking facilities". How on earth, does cooking facilities negatively affect our neighbors.</p> <p>We are all trying to figure out how to financially survive. Allow our Leduc county area to prosper with progressive thinking. If my mentally handicap grandson needs to live in my back yard in his own small building (with a stove)...why can he not. Yes I only have 4.7 acres, but there is LOADs of room here. If all our challenged humans have to go to facilities, it costs us ALL more in the long run. Let's start living like some of the Europeans. Let's allow aging parents the opportunity to have small houses in our back yard so we can easily care for them, as they maintain their own independence and</p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we appreciate your time.</i></p>

<p>dignity. Let's really open our thinking to making our County a leader in Alberta in Land Use Bylaw changes that are forward thinking!</p> <p>Mike and I are looking for some form of additional (perhaps passive) income to allow us to stay here until we pass. Why do we have to move to small towns and faraway municipalities, who are more progressive and as a result, financially more affordable. BC gives ~\$1000 back to acreage owners against assessed property taxes, because acreage owners look after all their own services. Lets take Leduc County to the forefront of municipalities. Lets think outside the box and improve the Land use opportunities! What other ideas can we consider.</p> <p>Certainly yes to weddings and agriculture events, but expand the activities that we "allow" land owners to embrace, as we "allow" ways to sustain our livelihoods and improve our communities.</p>	
<p>I know someone who lives close to a wedding venue and has had problems with the noise setting off her Livestock Guardian dogs...which in turn upsets the livestock.</p> <p>Let's keep our rural lands to the farmers.</p>	<p><i>Your feedback is appreciated.</i></p>
<p>I had the misfortune of living next door to a short term rental property (Air BNB) that was rezoned to 'recreational resort facility' with the eventual intent of turning it into a wedding venue. As an Air BNB property in the middle of developed country residential homes, we were all subjected to massive acreage parties that involved police, guns, drugs, noise, damage to the rental property and lost people showing up to my house trying to get in(sometimes aggressively). Some of these parties were weddings, since short term rentals have no laws to regulate or protect the owner or adjacent residents. One thing I can say for sure is that any venue where people are allowed to stay overnight and there is no staff to monitor (like a</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments.</i></p>

hotel) these "one-day-renters" are simply the worst people.

The 'Rural wedding and agricultural event facilities', if allowed, should be mandated to be fully staffed and no overnight stays.

On top of that, they should not be allowed within a 1 mile radius of country residential homes. I know there are no noise bylaws, thus the distance requirement. With that being said, these businesses should have a requirement to maintain the peace within the community. Maybe a large fine after being given 2 written warnings of complaints.

Another thought to be considered is police access/ distance for first responders. The police were called so many times that they told us they would set up check stops close to numerous rural Air BNB's and catch a lot of impaired drivers as part of a normal weekend of patrolling. I was also informed of another Air BNB close by that had someone overdose and die.

Cleaning is another issue I was shown at the Air BNB. Garbage was piled up and there are no apparent health guidelines for cleaning up inside and out.

I'm sure there is already consideration for the requirements for a liquor license, but thought I would note it.

A side thought is perhaps a minimum \$\$\$ for liability insurance in order to keep their business license.

In addition, I've copied the email I told you about, highlighted in yellow and bold below, about the county looking into regulation of the short term properties as far back as 2020 at least.

I hope you find my notes in order and if you need any clarifications, please, don't hesitate to ask.

<p>Where is this facility supposed to be built - I'm sorry, but it's hard to give an opinion on this when a person doesn't know what area this is being considered for. I for one would like to know what may be going into an area, not just if it affects me directly, but also for those who aren't made aware of these proposals or may not have the resources to access the necessary information.</p> <p>After having a "multigenerational" development built in our area without the ability to respond to the County about any concerns we may have had - even though we are designated as Single Family Residential - I feel like I have to pay more and more attention to what's going on in the County of Leduc, especially since the County is looking at perhaps making changes to current Land Use Bylaws.</p> <p>When it comes to Rural Wedding and Agricultural event facilities, I think it would be wise for the County of Leduc to make sure any adjacent owners of land in the area have a say - they will be the ones impacted by noise, traffic, etc. it should not be solely the County's decision. People move to live on acreages, farms, etc. for a more peaceful lifestyle, away from noise, traffic and lights.</p> <p>Thank you for reaching out to me - it's appreciated.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to reach out to us regarding this topic.</i></p> <p><i>This communication is not relating to any specific rural wedding and agricultural event facility. Rather, it is a request for input from the public regarding this type of use, which is currently one that could be approved within the County's Agricultural and Agricultural/Country Residential land use district, which takes in a large area of Leduc County.</i></p> <p><i>As noted in the letter, and the newspaper ads, the County is currently reviewing the land use bylaw regarding these type of facilities, and considering what types of amendments may be necessary to address concerns related to this particular type of land use.</i></p>
<p>I oppose the wedding venues in Rural areas. Just too much noise and increased traffic.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your time, thank you for participating.</i></p>
<p>B 48235 range road 10</p> <p>In regards to this development permit for the above property, as adjacent landowners we do have major concerns about the proposal as follows:</p> <p>- increased traffic with potential for impaired drivers from a function and no RCMP support to</p>	<p><i>Thank you for submitting your comments. We appreciate the feedback.</i></p>

<p>monitor for impaired drivers on a normally quiet county road.</p> <p>Will the county ensure that adequate monitoring is provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with 20 events from May to October it would likely mean a function at least every weekend</li> <li>- is there going to be a noise restriction or dampening put on the property because the noise carries right down the wizard lake valley terrain.</li> </ul> <p>Is 12:30 am too late for most residents in the area for loud music or noise interrupting sleep every weekend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- there was a function this summer and we could plainly hear the MC in addition to the music that we suspect came from the same location</li> <li>- we have heard that another similar wedding venue was shut down due to noise and nuisance issues this year in leduc county</li> <li>- the influences of impairment can include potential for impaired driving, potential violence and little or no control of the patrons attending or security to monitor behaviors to protect the interests of the neighbours.</li> </ul>	
<p>The concerns regarding the above subject matter are as follows:</p> <p>A. Regarding additional traffic joining the daily commuters on the roads will create considerable extra time which could eminent commuting traffic resulting in an increase in vehicular accidents or even fatalities. The intersection at Hwy. 21 and Range Road is already a major concern for commuters due to many accidents/fatalities that have already occurred.</p> <p>B. Regarding the noise factor is huge concern for adjoining neighbors and livestock. As the facility will be operating seven days a week, morning till night, farm properties and rural homes bordering or having a vertex or a vertex and side in</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your time – thank you for participating.</i></p>

<p>common, will be most affected due to the excessive chatter, music, roar of machinery and vehicles traveling to and from the facility. There us a grave concern when it comes to close proximity to livestock resulting in the animals becoming nervous and agitated which can result in dangement of said livestock.</p> <p>C. Regarding intoxicated/inebriated drivers or belligerent individuals leaving the facilities is a major concern in regards to accidents/fatalities and fighting and damage to neighboring properties and perhaps death of livestock.</p> <p>D. Regarding more excessive waiting times at the rural water station could increase.</p> <p>E. Regarding rural garbage station will definitely increase the need for more garbage containers and perhaps an increase in taxes. Also in regards to garbage blowing from the facility into neighboring properties as well as broken glass containers left on the rural roads creating extra cost for commuters having to replace vehicle tires or worse.</p>	
<p>This information is submitted in response to the December 21, 2022 letter sent to residents in our area with regards to Rural Wedding and Agricultural Events Facilities which have been given permits.</p> <p>It is great news that the County of Leduc is finally recognizing that such facilities pose huge problems to those of us living in these rural areas and that a review is currently being undertaken and that amendments with respect to the land use of Rural Wedding and Agricultural Events Facilities could be forthcoming. The County is considering that the discretionary use of land for Wedding Facilities in our area is NOT compatible with surrounding agricultural areas and to remove such bylaws which will prevent future permits being issued.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments.</i></p>

Our stance on this issue has NOT changed from our original feedback submitted in June of 2020. I can't believe it has taken this long for the County to recognize the problems and concerns for those of us living in and around such facilities, Developer are buying land in our rural community, not live here but to create wedding venues that are very profitable for these developers, Their only objective to make profit and are not concerned about the problems and dangers these wedding venues are creating for those of us who live and work in the area. The County needs to hear and understand that these facilities pose serious problems to us and to take the necessary steps to rectify and change any bylaws that would allow such facilities to be given permits. These developers have no respect for our rural way of living, they do not live at these facilities, have no concerns about the affects these facilities have on animals and residents in our area. They have no place in a rural setting. It is important that changes be made to have such Rural Wedding and Event venues be removed from being a discretionary use in our agricultural districts. Neighbouring Counties, Sturgeon and Strathcona, do not have these wedding venues listed in any of their rural zoning districts. Apparently, these Counties have completed their due diligence regarding the issues such venues can have. Now, the County of Leduc must also take the necessary steps to change our LUB. Again, attached to this message are our concerns and comments on this issue. Please review them and attach them to any communications necessary for County review.

*This respondent attached two information items to their comment submission:*

1. *Letter to SDAB Board Clerk, June 27, 2020*
2. *Letter, unaddressed, undated*

*Both of these information items have been received and reviewed by administration.*

<p>Again we are voicing our concern about rural wedding and event centers being allowed to be developed in the county. We are concerned with excessive noise, increased traffic and disruption to our lives.</p> <p>These establishments also raise many safety concerns such as use of fireworks, excessive alcohol consumption and destruction of roads and neighbouring properties to name a few.</p> <p>There are many other county facilities that can be used for such events that are equipt to handle large amounts of people that do not cause disruption to the everyday residents.</p> <p>In addition to the stress that this causes the neighbouring residents, the livestock and surrounding animals also bear brunt with increased noise and activity. We choose to live here for the peace and quiet.</p> <p>We strongly agree with having these rural wedding and event venues removed from being a discretionary use in our AG,AG/CR TR districts.</p>	<p><i>Your comments have been noted; thank you for connecting with us.</i></p>
<p>Please accept and consider the impacts living near a wedding venue in Leduc County has had on me and my farm animals. Based on personal experience over the past 2 years, and the negative impacts this wedding venue has had on my life and my animals' lives, I would like to thank you for considering an amendment to the Land Use Bylaw and it is my request that "Rural Wedding and Event Facility" be removed as a discretionary use.</p> <p>The following complaints and concerns have been reported in previous submissions and have persisted with the operation of the wedding venue in my area:</p> <p>1) Noise is a constant problem while these events are taking place. Not only from music but also noise from the crowds yelling, hollering, cheering, clapping. Speeches over sound system. There have been events with drums pounding</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments; we appreciate your participation.</i></p>

and the sound is very distressing to me and my animals. The tent does not prevent noise from travelling and causing disruptions

2) Increased traffic and dust in our area and down Range Road 225. There have been occasions where I am leaving my property and have had to wait behind cars and buses that are parked or lined up on the road at the venue site. Some cars have windows down and music blaring

3) This was a quiet community once with just local traffic. Now we get 80 vehicles (looks like more some days) coming and going. These people drive past the venue and turn around in my driveway, they turn around on township 504 in the middle of the road, they drive and speed down our roads. This creates a danger to this community

4) I cannot enjoy my property with all the noise and activity produced at this venue. I cannot invite my family and grandchildren over to sit outside and enjoy an afternoon or evening because of the noise created

5) I am concerned about the large events being held and the amount of drinking and driving in our community. My grown children are also worried about my safety at home and on the roads with these events taking place

6) Large buses coming and going. These are loud, the smell of diesel fuel makes you want to roll up your vehicle windows as you pass them on the road (Range Rd.225)

7) I am a senior who lives alone, and I now keep my gate closed and doors locked. Prior to this venue opening in our area, I felt safe. Now I am concerned for my safety with this nuisance/delinquent activity in our area and the safety of my animals. My daughter and sons have also expressed their concern for my safety and wellbeing

8) There is increased vehicle traffic down our road, and I am worried about those who are scouting out my property and my neighbors' properties for what may be of interest to them. I worry that they will come back into our community and steal. Not everyone has good

intentions, and these are strangers who are coming into our community. They have no investment here.

9) Noise and increased activity from this venue has caused significant distress to my companion animals and livestock. Bursts of noise especially from the microphone system have startled me and agitated my livestock while in pasture

10) There was a fire near this wedding property that jumped across to the neighbor's property. In the 30 years of living here nothing like that has happened. Now we have cigarette butts on the road by this wedding venue entrance. In fact, many things have been happening in this community that have never occurred in the past

11) Increased litter blowing around; beer cans and liquor bottles thrown on road and in ditches

12) People come to Leduc County, not to live here, but to buy land just to open these wedding venues and make a profit at our expense. They have no interest, respect, or concerns for those of us that live here. People attending these events are noisy, they yell, cheer etc. and this noise travels to my property. They create problems and dangers in our community that previously did not exist

13) The wedding venue near me has been strictly for weddings despite promising the county that agricultural events would occur.

Having this venue in our community has caused those that live here significant distress, concern, fear and has dramatically taken away my quality of life. **I don't understand how a wedding venue with all its noise and activity can be expected to be compatible with our land use. Based on the past 2 years is not compatible with the rural lifestyle. The noise, increased activity, nuisance behaviors and potential dangers are not compatible with rural living and not only impact the people, but our livestock. The reason that I live in a rural agricultural community is because I enjoy having my animals, but most of all I enjoy the peace, quiet and lack of activity. Wedding venues create the opposite. My biggest**

concern is for the safety and wellbeing of my animals and livestock. During each event, my dogs become agitated and bark continuously looking in the direction of this venue. The noise is very stressful for them, and I am concerned for their health and safety. My large dogs whose job is to protect me, my livestock, and my property are constantly wanting to go to the north edge of my property to protect their home. They sit and watch as these events are going on and are on "high alert" because of the noise and activity near their home. I am concerned that they may get hurt from someone at these events for just protecting their home and me. I am concerned that they may lose their life for just doing their job which is protection.

I am very concerned for the health and safety of my livestock. They graze in the pasture to the north closest to the venue. I have had agitated cattle, goats, sheep who end up being startled at the loud noises and my worry is that they will run through fences and become injured. My geese, chickens and ducks are running around the yard clearly distressed. The expense of covering veterinary bills is difficult enough but when someone is a senior living on a limited income, extra expenses caused by this venues activity and noise is truly unfair. Especially when this venue is profiting from our pain. I am also a senior who lives alone and having to chase my livestock that has broken through a fence to get them home is not an easy task. I would have to contact and inconvenience one of my neighbors to help. Chasing livestock in the dark is dangerous not only to the animals but also to me. In addition, any livestock animal whether it be mine or one of my neighbors that gets startled and bolts through a fence and runs down the road poses a safety risk to people driving on our roads. This venue with its noise and activity increases this risk significantly for us farmers. The cost of someone suing one of us because someone has been injured is a frightening thought and could cost us our livelihoods. And yet this business would carry on at no cost. **The County needs to remember that this is an agricultural community, and many**

**depend on their livestock to make a living. With animals getting injured and dying the livelihoods of farmers in this community are being affected.**

During one of the loudest and very big events here, I lost 3 of my calves – they died. **People who don't live in rural areas and own or are familiar with livestock, do not realize the impact such noise can have on animals. The hearing of dogs, cats, horses, cattle etc. is far more sensitive to these noises than that of us humans. Imagine what the people of this community hear and what our animals are hearing. The impact is huge for these animals.**

This is why my dogs bark more; coyotes are howling more and each feeds off the other. They know something bad and unnatural is happening in their "home" and they make it known and become vocal.

One of the most distressing things to me is that this business has continuously gone against the conditions of their permit. I was at the SDAB hearing at the beginning with the issuance of this permit and we were promised that they would follow the rules and conditions. This business has done the opposite and it seems like they do whatever they want at the expense of those that live here. **The County, in my perception is not able to regulate these wedding venues in a way that protects those of us that live in this rural area. I have provided complaints and concerns over the past two years and these businesses continue to operate and impact the lives of the residents.** No Bylaw officers or County officials seem to be available when these events are happening weeknights and weekends, and the residents here must suffer the consequences.

Those of us who have made Leduc County our home, who have lived here for over 30 years, pay our taxes, haven't been able to enjoy our homes and properties because of these wedding venues in our backyards. Why reward bad behaviors and punish those of us that have made this our home? Why punish the innocent animals that also have this community as their home. **It is my request that Council for the County of Leduc**

**remove “Rural Wedding and Event Facility” from a discretionary use in our AG and AG/CR TR districts. This would seem to be the only permanent way of preventing these businesses from impacting the people, companion animals and livestock that reside our County. There are many dangers associated with this type of business in an agricultural area. In Addition, the events cause noise and other nuisance that is disruptive to homes and agriculture. I do not see how any other amendments or conditions would solve the problems and incongruencies between wedding venues and rural agricultural living. The future of “Rural Wedding and Events Facility”? Again, in my opinion, they should be removed as a discretionary use in our AG and AG/CR TR districts. The problems with these wedding venues in our agricultural areas extends far beyond those of us that reside near or next to them. We need our agricultural communities protected and our citizens and livestock kept safe and free from dangers that these wedding venues bring to the community.**

I request that you take into consideration all my concerns and the impact this venue has had on my quality of life. I am not sure how many good years I have left, but I would sure like to live them in the peaceful, quiet rural community that I have come to know and love. I would like to live here in peace with my animals and have their quality of life also preserved.

*This respondent attached two information items to their comment submission:*

- 1. Noise Impact Assessment – Aspen Valley Wedding and Events Centre, Sept. 14, 2022*
- 2. Letter to [redacted] re: Aspen Valley Wedding and Events Centre Summary of Acoustic Work and Professional Opinion, Dec. 21, 2022*

*Both of these information items have been received and reviewed by administration.*

<p>As a county resident living adjacent to the Aspen Valley Wedding and Event Center, I would like to give a little feedback regarding the operation of said facility in this neighborhood. We live at 50435 RR225 and our house is set back off the road 100 meters in a fairly heavily treed area and every time there was an event at the facility, we could not sit out on the deck without hearing the noise generated from that facility. Secondly, the amount of traffic increases dramatically on the days when events are taking place. We moved from the city 20+ years ago to get away from noise and traffic of this nature. On a side note, one of the stupidest things I witnessed at this facility was landing a helicopter (I assume the bride and groom) in the dry field next to the event center. Events like this should be conducted on commercial land use areas.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your feedback.</i></p>
<p>We are writing to express our opinion regarding Land Use Bylaw 7-08 and the possible amendments to do with the land use of Rural Wedding and Agricultural Events Facilities.</p> <p>As residents of 50303 Range Road 225 we live in close proximity to a current Event Center that has been in operation for the last 2 years. We have submitted multiple letters in the past regarding our concerns about its proposed operation prior to opening, current operations, and future proposed operations in its latest application to the county.</p> <p>Throughout the past 2 operating seasons of Aspen Valley Wedding and Event Center we had multiple concerns including the noise level, increased road traffic, impact on livestock, impact on wildlife, littering, trespassing, and vandalism. Most people attending events at these facilities are not local to the area and do not have the same respect for the land, animals, or way of life that local residents do.</p> <p>Noise is one of our major concerns as we have found it to carry much further than what was promised by the operators of the facility. Based</p>	<p><i>We will consider your input – thank you for your time.</i></p>

<p>on where we live we should not be able to hear it at all according to them but many days the PA system could be heard throughout the afternoon as well as into the late evening which was very disruptive while trying to sleep. The sound of people shouting and hollering would also carry. This noise is also disruptive to all the neighboring livestock and wildlife whose hearing is much more sensitive than that of the human ear.</p> <p>The increase we saw in road traffic was also concerning. This most notably affected TWP 504 as well as RR 225. The Range Road became very dusty throughout the summer months and we were very concerned about any drinking and driving and the potential for traffic accidents. We also noticed an increase in litter throughout the operating season. This could be seen on the road as well as in the ditches.</p> <p>When you have hundreds of additional people coming to an area where they are likely drinking, possibly consuming drugs there is always a concern that trespassing and vandalism could also occur. People under the influence often lose many of their inhibitions increasing the potential for these things to happen.</p> <p>When we moved out here a little over 4 years ago we never thought one of these facilities would begin to operate so close to our home. We moved out here to enjoy a more peaceful lifestyle away from the hustle and bustle of the city, a key factor we share with many of our neighbors. The Event Centre has not impacted the community in any positive way and has caused lots of concerns and stress for us. We hope that they are no longer allowed to operate in our communities.</p>	
<p>I am writing to provide feedback on the rural wedding event facilities.</p> <p>These venues do not have a place in our rural communities. They impact our quality of life and interfere with our agricultural operations.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to provide comments.</i></p>

<p>There is one of these venues close to me and it has caused nothing but problems in the two years that it has been in operation. This venue has brought excessive noise, vehicles parked on the road, impaired driving, thefts, trespassing, and various impacts to livestock. Conditions related to the permit approval have served no purpose and have had no effect on the operation and disruptions caused.</p> <p>There are plenty of venues available to support these types of activities and there is no requirement to have them in our agricultural areas.</p> <p>I hope that the County takes our concerns seriously and <b>removes</b> Rural Wedding and Agricultural Events Facilities from discretionary use.</p> <p>Thank –you for your time.</p>	
<p>We are happy to hear that Land Use Bylaw 7-08 is beginning considered for amendments with respect to the land use of Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Centers. We are 3rd generation farmers who have lived just down the road from one of these facilities for the past two years. We have had to endure noise till late into the night, large buses parked on the main road, garbage, unsafe driving. With most celebrations drinking and driving is a concern. Trespassing and theft are always a concern but inviting hundreds of people out who don't understand rural protocol is never a good idea. All amenities are brought out from the city. This facility has never held an agricultural event. Our rural communities have halls to accommodate weddings etc. Our rural community shouldn't have to be concerned with the intrusion to our quiet, safe life style these facilities bring with them.</p> <p><i>This respondent attached one information item to their comment submission:</i></p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments, they will be taken into consideration.</i></p>

<p>1. Letter, unaddressed, undated</p> <p><i>This information items have been received and reviewed by administration.</i></p>	
<p>I am writing to provide our household feedback on these such venues as wedding event venues. In our experience as distant neighbors of the Olive Grove venue, was a horrible experience. We live a bit of a distance, however we could hear the music, announcements like they were in our backyard, sometimes the music would blare until 2 AM.</p> <p>Being a household of shift workers it was very disturbing to our way of life, let alone if we wanted to sit outside during the summer all we could hear was the sounds from their events.</p> <p>Neighbors went and talked to the venue owners to what seems to uncaring people, as they were told they had no plans on limiting their events, as per their website they could make 30, 0000 plus so it was quite lucrative. After that interaction they then posted a Security person at the end of their driveway so we could not complain.</p> <p>We also noticed higher than normal traffic, many vehicles would creep by our homes during the day, we often wondered how many impaired drivers may have left the venue creating an accident waiting to happen. As well as bring out many people who would not of otherwise been in our area, one never knows but it could lead to some rural crimes.</p> <p>As well they seem to have no regard for the neighboring farmland and the crops, as in a few pictures that were online (now taken off) they used the Canola fields for a photo op, as well as cut down some of the row of trees that bordered the 1 side of the field, when confronted they said that they though that the land was theirs and they bought the house and land on a handshake? Not too sure how one does not know their land boundaries.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your time, thank you for submitting comments.</i></p>

We are quite sure that the venue as a whole disrupted the wildlife that lives around our area, as we are on the Ministik nature site border we do value nature and do as much as we can to preserve the area we are blessed to live in, we have lived in our house for over 40 years now, and the peaceful rural living is what we love about living here! This venue angered most of us that live in this area. The music could be heard 2 miles down the road from those in have talked to.

We wonder about the impact on the water table if there are up to 200 or so people using washroom facilities, kitchen use etc., as once again we border a natural area, water is important to the Eco system of the Manistik sanctuary.

They have now turned the property into a Air BnB and photo studio, we fear that they could hold gatherings on the premise that its our renters party or a photo shoot. As they have in the past operated with no regard to proper licencing, permits or regard for the neighboring people.

We have talked to others that live near another such venue who also have similar concerns, so it is county wide what these venues create for others.

We hope that the county takes into consideration what we are living through as taxpaying members of the County of Leduc.

Noted there are many beautiful halls within our borders, we have a few close to mention New Sarepta Agri plex, Looma hall, Rollyview hall, Cloverlawn Hall, Beaumont has a great new facility which we should be promoting as venues as apparently they make great revenue!

We hope that if these are to continue they are met with some strict guidelines such as, a 11:00 pm shut down time (though that doesn't help with us shift workers)

<p>Some type of designated driver system, though that doesn't always work as the 1 venue also close the busses hum away at all hours and the fumes blow right into the 1 families home. No use of wells having to truck in their water. Having these such venues at a considerable distance from homes and natural areas. Having a fee per event to the county perhaps, or a certain type of business licence. These are just some of the concerns we have come up with.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration</p>	
<p><b>First and foremost, I would like to thank Leduc County Council and Administration for recognizing that these wedding and event facilities are creating problems and concerns to those of us who live in rural communities. Allowing those of us who reside in Leduc County to be able to participate in this public participation opportunity is greatly appreciated and means that our concerns and frustrations submitted over these facilities have been heard and are being responded to.</b> I would like to apologize if some frustrations in this letter come through, however my appreciation needs to be conveyed that a review is being taken by the County with regards to an amendment to the LUB and "Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility". Our experience is that they are <b>not</b> compatible with the surrounding residential and agricultural uses within our AG, AG/CR TR districts and request that they be removed as a discretionary use.</p> <p><b>As a Leduc County resident, I am providing feedback with regards to the Land Use Bylaw 7-08 amendment for "Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility".</b> First, my comments and concerns are based on personal experience from living next door to a wedding venue in this County. It is long and I apologize. My conclusions and feedback after living next to one for the past 2 years are as follows:</p> <p><b>These wedding venues are poorly regulated and perhaps a better statement would be that they</b></p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we have heard your comments and appreciate your time.</i></p>

**are not regulated at all.** The conditions placed on development permits are for the protection of those that reside around and in the vicinity of these venues. My interpretation is that conditions are meant to control or add a level of supervision to how the business is to operate in a discretionary use district. Conditions are to be enforced by Bylaw and should be adhered to by the owners of these businesses. First and foremost, bylaw enforcement does not exist after 5pm Monday to Friday and no one is available on weekends when most weddings take place to address complaints. If/when a business owner fails to adhere to the conditions of a permit and chooses to operate as they see fit for their clients, it becomes a situation where those of us that reside in the area are paying the consequences of the violations and are left to deal with the nuisance behaviors. Any concerns or complaints with regards to permit conditions or the operation of these wedding venues cannot be enforced by RCMP (unless a crime or serious incident occurs). The permits often they state, "in the opinion of the development authority" however, the County is unable to be available after hours to investigate concerns such as noise. **In our experience, over the past 2 years this venue in our area had been operating on a temporary permit. The operators continuously demonstrated that they were either unable or unwilling to conform to the requirements of that permit with the result that an incompatible and disruptive land use had become a real threat to the well-being of our community.** Development permits also note that "failure to comply with any of the preceding conditions will render this permit null and void". Submitting concerns and complaints after the fact does not stop the deviant/disruptive behaviors from reoccurring event after event. When the County does not have the resources or ability to enforce these conditions, and the business continues to operate delinquently, what is the point of these permit conditions? A discretionary use business in our rural area that cannot be regulated should not be allowed.

**With regards to land use compatibility with surrounding agricultural areas, these wedding venues have no compatibility.** Rural areas are generally quiet and peaceful with minimal traffic. The noise, traffic, and nuisance behaviors produced with these weddings are disruptive to people, livestock, companion animals and wildlife that reside in the area. Normal farming operations are impacted, and the quality of life for residents is dramatically affected. I don't feel that any amendments to the LUB aside from removing "Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility" as a discretionary use will prevent or eliminate the problems that are associated with a wedding/events business in a quiet rural community. The party, celebration atmosphere that is desired by patrons who spend enormous amounts of money to rent these facilities for weddings will always be the priority for the business. People want loud music, they want to dance, drink, and "let Loose" free of any restrictions. Patrons cannot be controlled by anyone with regards to how loud they are, where they wander or what types of behaviors they exhibit. The venue near us had "security" and is fenced as per permit conditions and yet problems still occurred. Cars parked on roads, people wandered off property and have bothered our horses, increase litter and thefts in the area etc. Security was a condition of the permit made by the SDAB to prevent these unwanted deviant behaviors and yet they still occurred. These events generate traffic that is greater than would be typical in an agricultural area. Increased traffic on our gravel roads create dust, while the activity at events generates significant noise and creates disruptive and nuisance behavior. Weddings means people being loud/obnoxious, partying, consuming alcohol, listening to loud music and so on. Rural farm life means quiet, peaceful and a lifestyle that co-exists with its surroundings in nature. Over the past 2 years, there has been nothing, but problems created and experienced by our rural community because of this city "party"

lifestyle that does not fit and should not be allowed in a rural area.

Consider: These developers advertise their wedding venue locations as “peaceful, serene, tranquil, within nature”. They then provide a service that creates noise, disturbance, and nuisance behaviors within our communities.

These developers do not know what rural living is about and they don’t care about the impacts on the residents and animals. Making money is the goal rather than considering what these weddings do to those of us that live in this type of community. I do not consider this compatible, considerate, or respectful of our agricultural areas.

**With regards to the Land Use Bylaw 7-08 in general, “the development is to be consistent with the general intent of the district and the overall character of the area”.** I am not sure where weddings and livestock/agriculture are consistent or congruent. The noise generated alone by these wedding venues is incompatible with the peace and quiet of rural living. Our mental and physical wellbeing has been impacted by the noise and stress of these weddings operating right next door. We have demonstrated that our livestock have suffered from the effects of such a business with injury, being disturbed by intoxicated individuals, having to be taken out of pasture while events are occurring and having training impacted. **Second, “the development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the area or materially affect the use, enjoyment, or value of nearby properties”.** We hear noise from inside our home. We cannot be outside on our property without being affected and disturbed by the noise produced from the weddings. Our dogs are constantly barking and agitated by the noise, and our horses are impacted. Farmers have difficulty moving machinery with the increased traffic and these people get upset when they are behind slow moving equipment. **Third, “measures have been taken to remedy any impacts on nearby properties”.** An outdoor facility with a tent as the primary structure is not a form of noise

mitigation, nor can it be. Trees and brush are not sound barriers. Ceremonies and activity happen all over this venue property where the noise cannot be controlled in any way. People are loud. They yell, cheer, etc. and as alcohol use increases and the night goes on, things get louder. People wander off this property despite a fence and “security” on this venue’s site. Patrons from this venue come over to trespass/bother our horses despite our “no trespassing” signs on our fence. Whether cars and or busses bring patrons the increased noise and traffic is problematic, constant and is bothersome in what should be an otherwise quiet community.

**Regarding the future of these wedding venues in Leduc County? I would like to see an amendment that prevents these Rural Wedding and Event facilities from operating in our AG and AG/CR TR districts.** We moved to the country to be away from noise, traffic, crowds and then one day to our surprise, we are burdened by a wedding venue next door. The problems with these types of facilities near homes, families, livestock, and other animals are far and wide and have been repeatedly presented by members of this community. Dangers associated with these wedding venues include alcohol use, DUI, patrons wandering from the venue property, trespassing, and interacting with livestock and so on. Add in the mental and physical stresses by those near these venues must endure. These weddings happen on weekends and in the evening when people are home from work or in from farmwork and want to enjoy time with family, not have family time taken away and be disturbed by wedding celebrations. The LUB states that the “development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the area or materially affect the use, enjoyment, or value of nearby properties.” Since this venue has been in operation our ability to enjoy our land, our home and our animals has been dramatically affected and impacted in many ways. Our personal and professional lives have been affected negatively from inability to sleep when events are occurring and from the stress of ensuring that our home and animals will be safe.

Farming operations including moving equipment when there is an increase in vehicle traffic, parking on roadways and erratic driving interferes with use and presents dangers. In deciding where these Rural wedding and Event venues are allowed to operate, significant consideration needs to be taken with regards to its location to rural residences and our livestock and farming operations. Within 200m, 650m and even 1000m is way too close and will impact people, livestock, and companion animals as this community has demonstrated. That impact has been felt by many in our community. Neighbors beyond 1.7km away from this venue hear noise and are impacted by the increased traffic caused by this venue. Our sound study and the sound study peer review undertaken by HGC Engineering with expertise in this area, validates the impact the noise alone has had on us and surrounding properties. Add in all the other complaints and concerns that cannot be controlled. Wedding venues bring alcohol related risks to our communities that extend for kms, well beyond the location of these venues. Problems associated with these wedding venues are not isolated to Leduc County, but all over Alberta and in other provinces. Recently other municipalities in Alberta revisited such land use bylaws. *It is not coincidence that these rural wedding venues are causing all the same problems within agricultural and Country residential communities province and country wide.* The problem is the service provided by wedding venue operators and what is expected by clients which is incompatible with the rural lifestyle. (December of 2022, Sturgeon County removed them from the AG, AG/CR districts, and currently Strathcona County does not allow for Wedding Venues in any rural area and only allows for Agri-tourism, eco-tourism in certain districts.)

It needs to be taken into consideration that the proposed uses of these wedding venues are “not accessory and incidental to the primary use that provides for an alternative of venue for events within a traditional setting” The venue is a tent,

and its only use is for events, namely weddings as this is where profit is. There is no other use to which it could be considered accessory or incidental. **The venue in our area has had a temporary permit for 3 years and in all that time, there has been no other use aside from weddings and possibly a birthday party. No agricultural events or anything related to agriculture has been demonstrated despite it being proposed on the initial DP.** It seems that these developers say that “we will hold agricultural events” as just a way to get the permit and then just hold weddings. No local businesses are used, and they do not support local. The residence where the wedding venue is located right beside us is not used as a primary residence and is not occupied. It is a vacant residence using the property to make money off weddings, that is it. The non-resident landowner and business owner (and their families) do not have to experience the detrimental effects of these wedding events as they are permanent residents of another jurisdiction. The abuse to our community and it’s residents by these developers and a business that is discretionary is not acceptable. Even if these wedding venues meet the requirements of the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility use, it is still a discretionary use in the AG and AG/CR TR districts. Having these wedding venues in our areas is not suitable given the circumstances and surrounding uses. Our community is comprised of residential and agricultural operations. Uses centered on gatherings for weddings cause noise and other nuisance that is disruptive to nearby residences and agricultural use. Over the past two years we have submitted concerns involving noise, traffic, concerns related to our livestock and other nuisance behaviors. Having these venues so close to residences and agricultural operations is not reasonable. Our property line is approximately 75m from this venue and as such our horses’ pasture is within this proximity to this venue and it is reasonable that our apprehensions for injury, agitation and disruption to our horses is very real and has been

experienced with each event. Veterinary costs related to injury associated with the disturbance across the road at this venue are expensive and placed on the owners. These discretionary use businesses that may be responsible for injury to animals are free from liability, yet if their patrons decide to cross the fence and interact and disturb our horses or get injured or injure our horses the expense and/or lawsuit is on us. This is a real concern for those of us that own livestock and it needs to be taken into consideration by the County. There needs to be significant separation from these wedding venues and those of us that reside in rural areas. People who reside in this area as far as 1.7km from this venue have been impacted. This distance from farms needs to be taken into consideration and removing these rural wedding event facilities from our AG, AG/CR TR districts is the most reasonable and permanent solution to protect our homes and lifestyle.

The definition of an “indoor facility” needs to be reconsidered. An indoor facility to me, is an enclosed building. The rationale for an indoor facility is to contain the noise and activity within an enclosed structure to reduce impacts on the immediate area. These frame and fabric structures are not indoor facilities. These wedding tents during the hot summer have the side walls open making it an open structure. The plastic walls if closed, do not mitigate sound from the music or crowd noise. Even if it was an enclosed indoor space, people wander all over the property during events, and off property, creating disturbance. The Ceremony space at the venue near us is not an enclosed space but an open area where the entire service is usually conducted over the microphone system which can be heard by the surrounding residence(s). Trees, brush, and slight changes in land elevations do not mitigate sound. People hang out in the parking lot and have had “tailgate parties” between the ceremony and reception, again creating noise, with drinking, and smoking in the parking lot. The parking lot seems to be

used as an alternative event space at some events.

It is my understanding that people are coming from the city, buying land in rural areas not to live and create a home with their families but to create these wedding businesses that can be lucrative. People will spend obscene amounts of money on a wedding and the business will cater to their clients. Unfortunately, this means not following permit conditions, not respecting, or having any consideration for the residents of the community. Unfortunately, the impact on surrounding residents is unimaginable or not apparent by those who do not live next to one of these venues. We have learned that most people that do not reside in the community have no respect or consideration for those that do.

**The County needs to consider those community halls and Agri-plex's in the County that are currently in existence. They are losing business because of these developers coming to use our land for profit. These halls are staples in these rural communities and need our support and the support of the County who has an investment in them. These halls provide for agricultural events, skating for kids in the winter, and family events like weddings in buildings that do not impact those residents around. Local residents who work at these halls, volunteer and maintain them for the members of our community are keeping our communities alive, safe and family and community orientated. The respect, commitment, and consideration to the community of those who use and run these halls is very real and needs to be preserved.**

Personal Experience:

Many years ago, we moved to rural Alberta to have peace and quiet and be away from the hustle and bustle of city life. We both work in healthcare, but we also have a second full time life here on our farm. We have horses that we have bred in the past and plan on breeding again. We farm a hay field that we cut to provide feed for our horses. We both enjoy being outside on our property riding/working with horses, riding

dirt bikes, having BBQ with family and friends, walking through the bush, and watching wildlife like deer and moose from our home and yard. It is the open space, the peace and quiet, the solitude of living here on our farm that provides mental and physical wellbeing. Then to our shock and surprise, a wedding venue popped up right across the road from our home and property, something that we never would have expected in a million years living where we are. Since this wedding venue has been in operation for the past 2 years, our life has been turned upside down and our quality of life has been taken away. There have been many significant problems that have impacted our quality of life in an extremely negative manner and have been submitted to the County over the past 2 years supported by photos and recordings from sounds heard on our property. I am certain that these complaints and concerns are not isolated to our experience but are experienced by others that have a wedding venue in their community, or worse right next door as in our case.

To Summarize:

- *Constant noise* while this venue is in operation with events from music, people on the microphone, crowds yelling, singing, cheering, etc.
- We hear full ceremonies over the microphone from our property, speeches to the bride and groom lasting for over an hour, just for examples.
- *Noise from crowds can be louder than the music.*
- Activity during the weekdays which also is disturbing from noise from the people and traffic. It gives us no rest from the activity and disturbances that occur at this venue site.
- A helicopter landed at a wedding in the tall uncut hayfield providing a fire risk and the noise from this low flying aircraft was startling to us and our horses.

- Increase in litter and alcohol bottles/cans around our ditches/road since this venue has been in operation.

- Traffic is constant with cars coming and going, creating dust, noise, car alarms going off/being set. We have traffic, noise, and smell from large diesel buses/school buses. Erratic driving down the township road and range road. Cars and buses have parked on our range road during several events creating problems for those of us who live here. Buses have loaded people from the road in the dark creating danger to persons and others driving on our roads. *These event venues create more traffic than should be expected in a rural area.*

- **Leduc County conducted a traffic study one weekend and I applaud the efforts, unfortunately the weekend it was conducted had one event, that was not representative of what occurs most weekends.**

- Alcohol use permitted: With over 200 people in attendance with these weddings, noise increases as people continue to consume through the night; increase in potential for drinking and driving in our area; we have seen people wander and stagger from off this property. As the event goes on for the night and people consume more alcohol, the noise and disruptive behaviors increase.

- *Patrons smoke on the edge of the range road and ditch* right across from our property leaving cigarette butts on the ground and increasing the likelihood for a fire to start with the long dry grasses. There was a fire in the ditch at the corner of the township road of this venue. The fire jumped over the range road to the ditch in front of our pasture. Danger from fire is very real from these venues and people who are careless and could destroy homes and property.

**Most significant is that our livestock have been affected.** People have wandered from this venue during events and have come to our fence line and bothered our horses, putting my horses and these people at risk for injury. I have had to pen

my young horses up at the barn for their safety during these events because of all the noise and unwanted behaviors from these patrons. They need feed while penned up, a cost that is extra when they should be on pasture. Our horses have a right to be in their pasture, not penned up because of these types of businesses that create unwanted behaviors.

- Training and riding horses when this venue is operating is impossible as the distraction is too much for my horses and they get spooked, lose concentration, and put me and them at risk for injury. I have had a horse injured and myself injured from the horses being spooked from bursts of noise.

- Veterinary costs are high when an animal gets hurt from being startled and bolting. Livestock running through fences and injuring themselves could be life threatening. Livestock is a business for farmers surrounding these wedding businesses and when an animal is injured or dies, it is a big hit to the farmer. Having someone interact with horses or cattle and get injured opens the owners up for a lawsuit.

We are in professions that require us to be always well rested and on our A game. When events are occurring, our sleep is impacted, we worry over our animals and property creating stress for us. We no longer invite our family or friends over for a visit or BBQ or enjoy doing things outside because the disturbance impacts our ability to enjoy these activities. When [redacted] is at work and I am home alone, he constantly calls to make sure that nothing has happened. He should be concentrating on providing care to his patients, not checking in with me to see if everything and everyone is safe.

**These types of businesses in our rural areas are not compatible with the surrounding lands and purpose of our land. This is a rural community, there is no place for a wedding venue right next door to livestock, homes, and families.** The conditions placed on these permits cannot be enforced as we have experienced over the past 2 years. The events happen in the evenings and

weekends when no bylaw officer is available. The event is on private property so no one can enter to investigate problems. Unless a fight breaks out, someone gets stabbed or shot or we find an intoxicated person lying in the ditch; an accident caused by a drunk driver, the RCMP will not come out. Nor should they as they have more important matters to deal with. I have spoken with AGLC, and they will not come out for an inspection when an event is going on to make sure laws are being followed because it is in a rural location, and they have larger facilities to deal with. The parking lot is often packed so full that no emergency vehicle could get in if required. Permit conditions require continuous access for fire and emergency vehicles. Again, this happens after business hours so no one from bylaw enforcement or fire services (who are busy ) can inspect or enforce. This community has experienced cars and busses parked on the road despite business permits stating that there shall be no parking on County roads. It is difficult or impossible for farmers to move equipment down our roads to crops when there are cars and busses parked.

In deciding where these Rural wedding and Event venues are allowed to operate, significant consideration needs to be taken with regards to its location to rural residences and our livestock. Within 200m, 1000m and even 2000m is too close and will impact people, livestock, and companion animals as this community has demonstrated. That impact has been felt by many in our community. Neighbors as far away as 1.7km and beyond hear noise and are impacted by the increased traffic caused by this venue. Wedding venues bring alcohol related risks to our communities, thefts, and vandalism, that extend well beyond the location of these venues. We have witnessed people coming to our community and showing a lack of respect to those that reside here and our lands. Rules, regulations, permit conditions go out the window when a business that is geared towards celebrations and includes alcohol, loud music, dining, dancing, is looking to please its

<p>customers, get good ratings on the internet, rather than show respect to the community and neighbors. The wedding business is geared towards customer satisfaction when they are spending tens of thousands of dollars for a one-day event. No one wants a lot of restrictions when it comes to music, having to keep voices down, etc. They will want to party and celebrate. The patrons are strangers that come from urban areas to our community to party and then leave. They have no concern or regards for those of us that live here including our animals, our property, and our safety. In fact, in our case, no one (the developer or family) occupies the residence on the subject land and are in no way impacted by the disturbance like those of us who call this our home 24/7.</p> <p><b>It is our request that Council and County Administration consider the negative impacts these businesses have had in our AG, AG/CR TR districts and remove them as a discretionary use. This is our home. It is a place that should provide peace, quiet, security and safety for us and our animals. We should be able to enjoy our property and farm our land without interference from these types of wedding event venues. We would like our home in rural Leduc County to return as it once was to enjoy again, to keep our agricultural land and country residential properties for generations to come so they too can enjoy rural living as it should be. Peaceful, quiet, and harmonious with nature. The risks and dangers to our communities are real and need to be addressed in a permanent manner.</b></p> <p><b>Please remove “Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility” from being a discretionary use in the AG and AG/CR TR districts within Leduc County.</b></p>	
<p>I would like to provide my comments regarding the allowing “Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility” as a discretionary use within AG and AG/CR TR districts. I’d like to start by thanking Leduc County Administration and Council for considering our concerns regarding</p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating, we have heard your comments and appreciate your time.</i></p>

the question of wedding facilities as a discretionary use within AG and AG/CR TR districts. This is a very important issue for us and all of our neighbors. We appreciate very much administration's willingness to be responsive and fair in dealing with us over the last few years. We appreciate that council has listened to the concerns that we, as well as all in our community have raised, and have responded in such an appropriate manner. Having one of these facilities operating immediately adjacent to our home for the last few years has been nothing short of an absolute nightmare for us! It has been obtrusive and disruptive to our lives to a degree that is hard to imagine unless you actually have had to experience living beside such an inappropriate business. It has had a dramatic negative effect on our lives that is unnecessary and inappropriate for any Leduc County resident living in a primarily agricultural area. These facilities have no place in any district that is primarily designated for agricultural use. They are simply parachuted into AG and AG/CR districts with attempts to make them look like they should fit, but don't actually fit in any way.

First, I'd like to clarify the name of these facilities – these are wedding venues only. These facilities rent for large amounts of money for weddings only, and the very lucrative wedding business is the sole motivation for their creation, period. In our experience there are no agricultural uses at all. Adding "Agricultural Event Facility" to the name is merely an attempt to make it sound like they should possibly fit within an agricultural district. It is like putting lipstick on a pig (my apologies for offending pigs, who do serve a legitimate purpose in an agricultural district). The term "secondary use as to agriculture" used in the amendment has no clear definition and is again an inadequate attempt to make it sound like these facilities have a place in an agricultural community.

The concept of "field to fork" sounds good on paper, but rarely, if ever, actually happens. In our

case the facility adjacent to us never used any local agricultural resources. Nor did it contribute in any meaningful way to the local economy. (A few local teenagers were very briefly and intermittently employed as casual labour for set up/cleanup only.) All we ever experienced were the extensive negative effects with virtually no benefits to the community.

The second method to try to make these facilities fit in an agricultural community is the extensive use of permit conditions required to try to minimize the negative impact on other rural residents. There are huge problems with these conditions for several reasons.

☒ The conditions are fundamentally in conflict with the wants and needs of those renting these facilities. The conditions act as constraints on the noise and behaviours associated with these wedding related events. The people renting these facilities want to come to the country and let loose without restrictions. (Looking at the Google reviews illustrates this very clearly.) This puts the owners of these businesses in a position where they have to choose between their high dollar paying clients and the restrictive conditions. It is clear from our experience that the business owners choose to ignore conditions to satisfy their clients' wishes.

☒ The conditions are virtually always unverifiable, impossible to monitor, impossible to police, and unenforceable. The county does not have the resources to send staff to these facilities for monitoring and verifying. Weddings happen on weekends making this even more of a problem.

These facilities are on private properties making access for verification or regulation dependent on the cooperation of the business owners. There is no simply or promptly executable enforcement actions available. In our experience although the permit clearly stated that "Failure to comply with any of the preceding conditions will render this permit null and void". Over the last 3 years we have submitted extensive examples of permit condition violations with

extensive proof. There have been several situations where County demands were simply ignored or blatantly violated. Despite these clear and well documented condition violations, the county was powerless to render the permit null and void, and operations, (and the condition violations) simply continued unabated.

☒ The specific details within the conditions were often inadequate, leaving the business owners to use their own interpretation while operating. For example, in our situation, operating hours were interpreted by this business owner in a manner that had significant negative impact on us.

His operating hours were specified as Friday and Saturday 0900 AM to midnight and Sunday 0900 AM to 1500 PM. There were frequently activities during the week (wedding rehearsals during weekdays, set up and tear down outside of the specified hours, etc.). The midnight closing time for this operator meant music would be played until midnight (often beyond) leaving the party, noise, etc. to continue well beyond midnight. All of these activities outside of specified operating hours had significant negative impact on us. Third, the notion of them being agriculturally harmonious is a somewhat bizarre concept. Our agricultural areas are quiet and peaceful, with little noise, low traffic volumes, small numbers of people, etc. These weddings facilities bring large traffic volume, noise, and large numbers of people who want to party with no restrictions on the noise they create and the behaviours they exhibit. It is the ultimate irony that these businesses sell the fantasy of having their wedding in a peaceful, tranquil, quiet environment and yet when they come to our community, they destroy all of these qualities for those of us who actually have invested our lives here. These businesses are fundamentally at odds with the rights of the neighbors and the county philosophy Noise requires special mention because of the huge impact it has on other residents and animals. The noise associated with weddings

*(ceremonies as well as receptions)* is especially bothersome to people and animals. We have extensive evidence demonstrating how disturbing and offensive the noise can be.

We had a very professionally done sound study by experts that validates our complaints regarding the excessive noise we were subjected to constantly. We have extensive well documented negative effects on us and our livestock/animals, including injuries. This noise is completely foreign to a rural area, and completely different from the expected noise from animals and farm machinery. All rural Leduc County residents share an appreciation for a quiet peaceful lifestyle. The noise created by these wedding facilities completely destroys this peaceful quiet lifestyle.

The Municipal Development Plan specifies that “A responsible growth pattern not only reduces the development footprint of the County and conserves agricultural lands, but also contributes to a high quality of life for residents” and “Agriculture is a mainstay of the County’s economy and its way of life”, “policies affecting the Rural County are intended to maintain the rural character and conserve agricultural land”. There are multiple references in the MDP to the lifestyle of County residents. These wedding venues have huge negative impact on this valued lifestyle and are incompatible with the MDP.

One has to ask the fundamental question - who is it that wants these facilities. It is certainly not county residents. I have not found a single County resident who supports these businesses in our area. There is nobody who would like one of these businesses adjacent to their property. It is almost exclusively non-resident landowners who want these businesses here, and it is we, the county residents, who have to suffer the ill effects. There are virtually no economic benefits to the county. The additional tax revenue is negligible. There are however increased demands on County resources that very quickly negate any

small increase to the County coffers. There are very few, if any, local businesses that benefit from these facilities. The vast majority of businesses that may benefit are from the city. The large sums of money generated from renting these facilities simply goes to the pockets of the business owners. These non-resident landowners don't have any ties to the land, are not part of the community or very limited ties to the local community.

I'd like to point out the issue of residents having to deal repeatedly with persistent applications to continue the disruptive and inappropriate business adjacent to us. There were over 40 community member objections to the initial permit application, over 80 people that supported our SDAB appeal, a multitude of people that have repeatedly submitted concerns and objections to repetitive applications June 2022 and Dec 2022, and multiple responses objecting to this facility to the LPRT appeal last June. ***I think our community has made their opinions and concerns absolutely crystal clear.*** Repeatedly having to deal with these applications every six months or so is a form of abuse that we simply don't deserve. County Administration also has to put up with these repeated requests. I believe that removing this type of business as a discretionary use may finally put an end to this incessant time and energy consuming abuse. *[Redacted]* and I, all of our community members, and County personnel have more important things to do than continually deal with this same issue.

At the end of the day, is the huge burden to ensure proper fit, compliance, etc. worth the very few, if any, benefits? I think the answer is an ***emphatic and resounding no!*** These businesses do not fit and cannot be made to fit in a primarily agricultural area. I believe realistically the best plan would be to delete this discretionary use from the Land Use Bylaw.

Given our very recent correspondence submissions to Leduc County and the Land & Property Rights Tribunal with regards to Development Permit D22-214 Rural Wedding & Agricultural Events Facility, we request that our personally submitted appeal correspondence be utilized for this purpose in it's entirety.

There are details raised that were obviously specific to that development appeal, nonetheless, a concerned voice within that correspondence needs to be heard. There was considerable time and thought given into our preparation of that appeal and the related hearing and concerns that were raised and most definitely pertain to your current request for feedback from the community at large.

From a general standpoint, we are highlighting our key areas of concern below, all of which were noted in the above referenced appeal correspondence. This list is by no means restrictive, therefore, we request our complete correspondence be referred to. Key areas of concern are as follows:

Noise and dust control - This includes noise and dust impact from road traffic and noise from the event facility. Direct road/highway access to facility (gravel or paved) should also be a consideration affecting this area. How are noise and dust acceptable limits established, compliance ensured and enforcement carried out? What are future management plans? \*

Traffic safety - Rural gravelled roads (often with equipment) and highway turnoffs, given increased traffic to any proposed facility, is a major safety concern. One must also add littering and fire risk and the impact on wildlife and agricultural land/preservation/maintenance/value. Again, how are these issues currently managed/future management plans? \*

Underutilization of existing rural community facilities - We're certain there has been

*Your input is appreciated, thanks for participating.*

considerable fundraising and grants provided for maintenance and upgrades of many of these facilities. Perhaps the County could consider collaborative ways to utilize these facilities to their potential and keep the rural spirit alive instead of approving additional private facilities.

Land size of any proposed facility and distance from adjacent property owners - A list of comparable wedding and event facilities which identifies location and property size was prepared and enclosed in our original submission.

Indoor facility compliance - What specifically does and does not constitute an indoor facility?

Facility hours of operation - How do facility operational days/ hours of existing/potential future facilities affect the existing community?

Current/future facility impact on the Value, Use, and Enjoyment of existing adjacent property owners/residents - This point needs to be carefully and seriously addressed by all development decision makers at the time of approval consideration.

\*Parameters, regulation, compliance and enforcement of any and all "acceptable level" restrictions pertains to many areas and should be kept in mind in this current review and any proposed amendments.

We also feel Leduc County should consider readdressing their internal review and approval process.

1. We strongly believe any facility development/renewal, despite "discretionary" agricultural use, should continue to be open to public/adjacent property owners' review and input. This input, however, should be strongly considered and completely addressed. Providing appropriate time for the public to complete due diligence is also

<p>imperative to ensure every party is informed and given an opportunity to provide feedback.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Full public disclosure of any proposed facility non financial business plans and/or expansion plans should be mandatory prior to County development approval. We understand this is likely a sensitive area for the hopeful developer, however, this should not be withheld information given the facility’s potential impact to adjacent landowners.</li> <li>3. Both current and future impact should be questioned and considered by the County prior to any temporary/short term approval.</li> <li>4. Perhaps an equal representation of council members to County officers should be part of the potential development review as they largely represent the voice of the community and affected residents.</li> <li>5. The County might strongly consider approval of such “agricultural discretionary use” facilities by a planning commission or County approval “board” which includes equal council vote.</li> </ol> <p>We commend the County for revisiting this bylaw and reaching out and listening to the voice of the community in this request for feedback. Perhaps addressing any wedding and event facility development approval request in the manner of, “Is it the best use of the property?” would be a thoughtful question or “Would the facility best be relocated to a commercially zoned area?” We trust decisions/amendments will be made for the positive impact of all affected.</p> <p>Finally, preservation of the agricultural community and environment (Use, Value &amp; Enjoyment) must be a priority in all considerations and decisions made.</p>	
<p>We are county residents who reside adjacent to a past wedding and agriculture event facility. I am</p>	<p><i>Your input is appreciated, thank you.</i></p>

grateful for the opportunity to offer feedback on the Land use bylaw 7-08.

My recommendations are;

1. To separate types of land use currently outlined in this Bylaw into two separate categories;
  - a) wedding and event venues
  - b) farmers markets, trade fairs and re-treat type businesses.

The reason for this recommendation is that different types of events have different effects on neighboring properties.

2. Wedding and event facilities whose intentions are to host large celebrations should require a minimum distance from other residences. As many of the conditions outlined in the permits are unattainable when they are located in such close proximity. Such as:

***-No noise impacts from the approved development shall be deemed to have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. The applicant may be required to implement sound abatement measures if noise associated with the approved development is audible from the neighbouring properties.***

***-The use of the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility shall not impose any impact on the community, such as noise, smoke, steam, odor, dust, vibration, glare or traffic that is offensive or excessive in the opinion of the Development Authority.***

After our experience we do not see how even an indoor facility that was properly sound proofed and managed would have been able to limit the noise from the vehicles and people coming and

going outdoors so close to the neighboring residences.

During the tribunal, the applicant said that he would have rather been told from the start that his location was not suitable for a wedding and agriculture event facility based on the distance from other residences.

It is for these reasons we strongly recommend that a Wedding and Event facility bylaw should require a minimum distance from neighboring residences.

3. My final recommendation is to implement a system that holds the applicants responsible for acquiring proper safety, sewer and other permits required for their facility. As well as accountability to the conditions of the proposed application.

In our situation the applicant violated many of the conditions of his temporary permit and was still able to apply for an additional permit that would have allowed him to accept more guests, more vehicles and extend his hours, despite not having completed the necessary changes to sewer, safety inspections, or any of the conditions that were agreed upon.

The ownness landed on the community, the residences that had been affected, instead of the simple fact that the applicant had not followed through with the criteria of the temporary permit. We are still very unclear on why a second permit was considered when the conditions of the temporary one had not been accomplished.

We choose to live where we do because of the beauty and peacefulness that comes from nature. The ability to work with the county to have agriculture facilities that are complementary to rural living is commendable. We appreciate the support we have received

<p>from the County of Leduc and the opportunity to provide feedback.</p>	
<p>I am a neighbour to one of the proposed wedding sites in Leduc County</p> <p>There are three major players in the proposal for a wedding site</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Leduc County</li> <li>2. The resident organizer.</li> <li>3. The neighbouring residents</li> </ol> <p>Number one and two of their reasons for this event to take place are very important , but I am more concerned with the neighbouring residents</p> <p>I think it's a very complicated formula that has to be investigated fully in order to make a decision on an event that may cause disruption to the local residents</p> <p>We have to take into account the residents that live close to the event centre and those who may live a distance away or be on the road way in which the people travel to and from</p> <p>Most importantly, the people who live close by, could also have more say than those who may live some distance away as they may be affected more.</p> <p>Also considerations of how long they have lived in the area and also the age of the residents It is no secret that older people have a more pronounced view of their area as they have lived there for many years, decades and in many cases in Leduc County generations. Younger people may be more tolerable about their privacy. Also concerns of the practices of farmers,ranchers,and acreage owners. Will these events cause disruption to moving cattle, moving machinery and any other circumstance in which the resident would be using the roadway. All these considerations are very important.</p> <p>I think we can all understand that on the particular day of the event, there will be some disruption to the neighbouring people</p>	<p><i>Thanks for your feedback, we appreciate your participation.</i></p>

<p>This disruption could be in the form of increased automobile travel or noise, and could last for a good portion of the day</p> <p>We also must take into consideration why people want to live in the country and what sacrifices they are willing to put up with.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peace and quiet.</li> <li>2. Privacy. This is a huge one. Urban people for the most part fence their property or stay in their house for privacy. Most country folk want to sit outside and without the disruption of fences look at sun rises, sun sets, animals and wheat fields They don't want people to drive by and look at them</li> <li>3. More likely to see birds and animals not found in urban areas</li> <li>4. Raise animals from large ranches to small numbers that can be found on acreages like goats, sheep,chickens and horses,</li> <li>5. Having small or large gardens either for their own use or enough to sell at local Farmers Markets</li> </ol> <p>We must take into account that these people living in the country are willing to sacrifice to drive a longer distance for groceries, entertainment, doctors, and other such needs Driving longer distances also means they are willing to pay more for gas for their vehicles, to wear out their tires and their vehicles sooner than living in an urban area. They have consciously made that decision to live peacefully in the country and their willing to pay for it. Thank you for listening to my concerns</p>	
<p>Thank you for the request for input regarding land use for rural event facilities, I do have some input regarding these venues. We have the White Wood Barn in close proximity to a few of our properties and directly adjacent to one of them so have first hand experience on their impact to the community. I can appreciate the need for these venues and am not against them but do have concerns about the regulation and</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your insight; thank you for participating.</i></p>

enforcement of the conditions of their development approval.

We currently live at 48238 RR 251 which is 1.67km's away from the White Wood Barn and on multiple occasions have heard the music from this venue. We also own two 80 acre parcels directly West of the White Wood Barn and have plans of building our future home on one of the properties, the building site would only be 1 km away from the venue and am greatly concerned about the noise from the venue to the point where it is affecting our decision to want to build on that site. As per the approved development permit for the White Wood Barn, point 8 states that the event facility shall not impose any impact on the community, such as noise, smoke, steam, odor, dust, vibration, glare or traffic that is offensive in the opinion of the development authority. I would argue that hearing the event facility from almost 2 km away affects the noise impact of the community not to mention what I would hear from our future yard site. I have attended multiple events in this type of facility and I believe they do have their place when they don't have a negative effect on the community.

The point in this being is everyone has a different tolerance on what is an acceptable noise level and what is offensive or excessive and the reality is if the development authority doesn't have my same opinion I may never be able to build our home on land we own. I believe most noise bylaws within city limits are in effect as of 11 pm, why is it that I have to listen to it until 2 am when I live in a rural setting?

Other than calling the County to see what my options were I haven't made any official complaints because these people are also my neighbors and I'm sure they will find out where the complaint came from if one is filed.

I support the Whitewood Barn and facilities like it, but not at the cost of the peaceful enjoyment of my own property. If the County can regulate

<p>these facilities where they "shall not impose any impact on the community" then I am in full support. I would like to see what that procedure would look like.</p>	
---	--

**Phone submissions**

Between Dec. 20 and Jan. 20, we received input from **seven respondents** over the phone. The following are summarized submissions and a summary of the response provided.

<p>Comment (<i>summarized</i>)</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>The caller expressed concerns relating to conflicts created with short term rentals being used for weddings as well as other types of types of events/parties without any approval for a “rural wedding and agricultural event facility”. The caller indicated that the noise and other issues including the presence of guns and drug and alcohol use have created disturbances requiring police to be called in. This caller indicated that they feel this type of use needs to be strictly regulated and should not be a use that can occur in within less than a one mile radius to any residential development, should have security on site, and not allow any overnight accommodation. This caller later provided a written submission detailing their concerns.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your comments. Thank you for participating.</i></p>
<p>The caller expressed concerns regarding an existing rural wedding facility located in the area. Concerns noted were related to noise, increased traffic in the area and security issues due to so many people coming and going in the area. This caller indicated that a vehicle was stolen from their lands, and in speaking with neighbors, there seems to be an increase in theft in the area.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments.</i></p>
<p>This caller expressed concerns regarding impacts that these type of facilities may have area residents with respect to how they function, the traffic and noise they generate. There was also the concern of potential disruption on agricultural operations. Examples noted included</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your time, thank you.</i></p>

<p>problems moving cattle and machinery on the roadway. This caller later provided a written submission detailing their concerns.</p>	
<p>This caller indicated that they felt these types of facilities didn't really fit within the agricultural or country residential community due to the noise and traffic they will generate. It was indicated that these facilities would create a nuisance to agricultural operation and peaceful living.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your comments and insight. Thank you for participating.</i></p>
<p>This caller indicated that although they own land in the area of an existing facility, they had no concerns as they don't live in this area.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to call us.</i></p>
<p>This caller indicated that, as operators of an existing rural wedding facility, they are more interesting in moving forward with more of a focus on an agritourism type operation in the future, and would like to have some further discussion with the County in this regard.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate your interest in progressing in the agri-tourism industry. We are currently reviewing our Land Use Bylaw in its' entirety, and we welcome your input on this subject as we move forward.</i></p>
<p>This caller indicated that they reside a bit of a distance from a wedding facility, however, they could hear the music and blaring until early hours of the morning during events. It was indicated that this facility created a nuisance for them and was disturbing to their way of life, as shift workers. Additionally, there were concerns expressed regarding increased traffic in the area and rural crime in the area. This caller later provided a written submission detailing their concerns.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for participating. We've heard your comments and they will be considered throughout the process.</i></p>

**What we learned and what we're doing**

After reviewing all of the input received from participants, we've identified the following takeaways:

1. It has been expressed that these type of uses are not compatible with agricultural or residential uses. Due to the inherent nature and purpose of these types of facilities and the way in which they operate, it has been identified through this process that these facilities have been known to create circumstances that are disruptive to everyday living in the rural agricultural and residential areas.

2. It has been indicated that the operations of these types of facilities have been conflicting with farming operations, creating stressful situations for livestock to the point of injury, concerns of possible trespassing onto the private land surrounding these facilities have also been widely noted through this process.
3. Issues noted throughout participants comments include increased potential for impaired drivers on local roads and highways, increased risk of fires that may be a result of people smoking or using fireworks and increased risk of rural crime occurring in the areas surrounding these facilities.

Based on the input received through this outreach, administration will be proposing an amendment to the Land Use Bylaw.

The amendment would amend Section 9.1.3 of the Agricultural District and Section 9.2.3 of the Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional District **to remove the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility land use from the list of Discretionary Uses in these two districts**, and to identify existing and approved rural wedding and agricultural event facilities as Discretionary Uses.

A public hearing on the proposed amendment will be held on **Tuesday, Feb. 14, 2023 at 1:15 p.m.** during the regular Leduc County Council meeting. To learn more about the public hearing process and how you can participate, visit [www.leduc-county.com/public-participation](http://www.leduc-county.com/public-participation).