



LEDUC
COUNTY

What We Heard Report
Land Use Bylaw update
Phase two

Updated: Feb. 13, 2024

Table of Contents

Background	3
Public participation approach	3
What we asked.....	4
How we communicated	4
How you participated.....	5
What you told us.....	6
What we've been working on	11
Next steps	11

Background

Land Use Bylaw update

Alberta's *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) requires every municipality to have a land use bylaw. In Leduc County, Land Use Bylaw 07-08 (LUB) is the primary document used to guide decisions on planning applications for everything from building a shed to building a shopping mall. It divides the municipality into districts and outlines what types of development is allowed on each parcel of land in the county.

The LUB also contains regulations concerning topics like subdivision design, building specifications, landscaping, parking, signs, and outlines a process for reviewing development permits.

Having these standards set within the LUB keeps the location and forms of physical development compatible and is foundational to safe, good-looking communities.

Leduc County's LUB was originally adopted in 2008 and has been amended 129 times since its adoption. A thorough review of the bylaw was initiated in July 2020 to align with the County's recently adopted Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and the MGA, as well to create a user-friendly, comprehensive document that supports growth in the county, streamlines processes and protects our resources.

Public participation approach

It is crucial public participation be undertaken at multiple points in this project, given the prevalence and impact this bylaw has on both County residents and businesses.

In 2021, we conducted phase one of public participation, where we asked the community to help identify issues and areas of concern, in addition to providing direction on the public participation strategy for phase two. Visit yoursayleduccounty.com to read about the project and the What We Heard report for phase one.

The **consult** level of our [public participation spectrum](#) was chosen for the second phase of the LUB update. At this level, we commit to keeping the public informed, listening to and acknowledging concerns and aspirations, and providing feedback on how public input influenced the decision. This is why we are reporting these results back through this report.

Decision to be made	Level of participation	Technique(s)
Is the vision and direction presented by administration aligned with the community?	Consult	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open house input• Online comment form• Email submissions• Phone submissions

What we asked

Since the first round of public participation, we have drafted new administrative and process sections of the LUB and developed a general vision for many of the key topic areas.

In phase two, we wanted to know if the vision and direction presented aligned with the community's wants and needs.

Through the online comment form, we asked participants to consider the following questions:

1. What do you think of the overall vision we've shared for the bylaw so far?
2. Do you have any comments on the information in the administrative and process section?
3. Do you have any comments on the information in the Nisku Business Park and business section?
4. Do you have any comments on the information in the urban living and the Vistas section?
5. Do you have any comments on the information in the agriculture section?
6. Do you have any comments on the information in the other topics section?
7. Do you have any additional comments or feedback you would like to share with the County?
8. Would you like a member of the project team to contact you to discuss your feedback further?

How we communicated

HOW WE COMMUNICATED

 **19** e-newsletters sent |  **21,387** County Chronicles mailed
 **16** advertisements published |   **19** social media posts

Participation for phase two was open from June 5 to Nov. 30, 2023. We promoted the opportunities for input in the following ways:

- ▶ **County Chronicle:** we shared information about the project and how to get involved in Leduc County's quarterly publication, the County Chronicle, which was mailed to all property owners in June and September. In the December issue, we thanked citizens for participating and shared that a What We Heard report would be available early 2024.
- ▶ **Your Say Leduc County:** we published a Land Use Bylaw webpage on Leduc County's public participation website, yoursayleduccounty.com. The page, yoursayleduccounty.com/shaping-your-county provided full project details including a question-and-answer section, feedback boards, comment form, news feed and project updates.

- ▶ **Media release:** we sent media releases to local media on June 13, July 31 and Nov. 15, which included details on the project and upcoming open houses that took place on June 21, Aug. 9, Nov. 20, 21 and 22.
- ▶ **Newsletters:** we shared project information in the following newsletters:
 - County Express newsletter (internal) – eight editions
 - Land Use Bylaw project newsletter (external) – seven editions
 - Public participation newsletter (external) – 12 editions
- ▶ **Print advertisements:** we ran 16 print advertisements between the Leduc Representative and Connect 39 newspapers promoting the opportunity to participate and directing readers to the project web page.
- ▶ **Roadside signs:** we placed six roadside signs throughout Leduc County to advertise the first open house that took place on June 21, six roadside signs throughout Leduc County to advertise the second open house, which took place on Aug. 9 and seven roadside signs throughout Leduc County to advertise the open houses that took place on Nov. 20, 21 and 22.
- ▶ **Social media advertising:** we booked paid social media advertisements to run from June 7 to 21, and July 26 to Aug. 9, respectively. However, social media advertisements were unpublished in August due to several unrelated comments being posted on them.
- ▶ **Social media posts:** we posted 19 social media posts on Leduc County's Twitter, Facebook and LinkedIn accounts, promoting the opportunity to participate and directing readers to the project web page.
- ▶ **Website notices:** we posted three website notices containing project details on our business website, leduccountybusiness.com.

How you participated

HOW YOU PARTICIPATED

 **178** open house comments
 |
  **4** emails received
 **790** social media engagements
 |
  **12** online comments

We received:

- ▶ **Emails:** 4 submissions via email.
- ▶ **Mailed submissions:** 0 submissions via post mail.
- ▶ **Open house comments:** 178 comments from five open houses.
- ▶ **Online comments:** 12 submissions through the comment form and idea wall on the project web page.

- ▶ **Phone calls:** 0 submissions via phone.
- ▶ **Social media engagements:** 790 clicks, reactions, comments and shares.

What you told us

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received ~200 comments about the Land Use Bylaw update project.

*Please refer to Appendix A for a full list of verbatim comments and responses from administration.

The top three sections that received input

1. Agriculture received 38.5 per cent
2. Overall vision, and general comments received 22 per cent
3. Nisku Business Park received 10.5 per cent

Of note, some comments and feedback weren't related to the project; therefore, not included in the summation. Additionally, there was more than one comment in various submissions, which have been separated and added into the project themes, in efforts to encapsulate all feedback received.

Top themes overall

Common themes were pulled from public feedback, and the top three are highlighted below.

Allowing personal choice for development on rural land

The top theme was in the agriculture section and overall, respondents wanted residents and property owners' personal choice to develop on their land, which was 16 per cent of all received comments and 41.6 per cent of all Agricultural section comments. Respondents wanted access to these following opportunities:

- ▶ secondary suites.
- ▶ small scale agriculture and livestock on rural properties.
- ▶ various forms of agritourism.
- ▶ home based businesses.
- ▶ outbuildings, storage sheds and accessory buildings without a dwelling.
- ▶ grandfathering of historical operations and buildings.

Environmental protection

The second most common theme that was spread out throughout all sections was protection of the environment with 28 comments totaling 14 per cent of all received comments and included:

- ▶ natural areas.
- ▶ watersheds.
- ▶ wetlands.
- ▶ creeks.

Protection of farmland

The third most common theme was protection of farmland with 14 comments totaling seven per cent of all received comments and 18 per cent of all Agricultural section comments.

Public participation

In phase two of public participation, the public was invited to offer feedback and comments toward all aspects of the LUB through various key themes including, but not limited to:

- ▶ Overall vision
- ▶ Administration and Process
- ▶ Agriculture
- ▶ Lakeside Living
- ▶ Nisku Business Park and Business
- ▶ New Sarepta
- ▶ Urban living and the Vistas
- ▶ Subdivisions
- ▶ Resource Extraction
- ▶ Genesee
- ▶ Rural Living

Key themes

The following are the themes that emerged from public feedback. Numbers and percentages are reflective of the total comments received for each section area and all received comments.

Overall vision

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Environmental, natural area, watersheds, wetlands, wildlife habitats and creek protection.	19	43	9.5
Require notification and consultation with property owners about potential development.	7	16	3.5
Do not allow dense urban development on or near country residential.	5	11.3	2.5
Specific regulations for different types of properties, lot size and individual request.	3	7	1.5
Provide natural areas, parks and outdoor recreation opportunities.	2	4.5	1
Reduce regulations and any unnecessary application requirements on developers.	2	4.5	1
Ensure regulations are enforced for improper land use.	2	4.5	1
Need to have regulations regarding renewable energy projects to protect neighbours.	1	2.3	0.5
Septic systems for subdivisions must be environmentally sound.	1	2.3	0.5

The application process needs to be kept to ensure transparency and should be separated from the development process.	1	2.3	0.5
Discretionary use should be included to make it clear what considerations are given to a discretionary use.	1	2.3	0.5
Total	44	100	22

Administration and process

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Fines and penalties for land use violations.	3	33.4	1.5
Ability to deviate from MDP and Area Structure Plan (ASP) with conditions.	2	22.2	1
Do not want provincial fines or the County to verify development.	1	11.1	0.5
Want County to retain fines and enforcement in-house without deferring to province.	1	11.1	0.5
Need a streamlined process while having reasonable and appropriate review and approvals.	1	11.1	0.5
Define what a park model trailer is.	1	11.1	0.5
Total	9	100	4.5

Nisku Business Park and business

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Environmental protection and compatibility.	5	24	2.5
Landscaping in Nisku similar to new North Nisku or City of Leduc.	3	14	1.5
Direct control districts align with future development.	3	14	1.5
Reduce the number of discretionary uses.	3	14	1.5
Staged development in Nisku to fill central Nisku before North Nisku.	2	10	1
Have a streamlined approval process and be open to future business and manufacturing.	1	4.8	0.5
Public transportation (bussing) is needed in the whole of Nisku.	1	4.8	0.5
No urban or industrial approval east of Spine Road for 20 years.	1	4.8	0.5
Spine Road adds a lot to the betterment of the Nisku area plan.	1	4.8	0.5

Nisku Business Park needs business attraction.	1	4.8	0.5
Total	21	100	10.5

Agriculture

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Allowing personal choice for development on their rural land.	32	41.6	16
Protection of farmland.	14	18	7
Enforcement of development permits, unsightly property and noise.	11	14.4	5.5
Protection of water bodies with minimum setbacks.	4	5.2	2
Entering private land with permission.	3	4	1.5
Hazard waste management to protect the environment and water supply.	2	2.6	1
Secondary Suites should be regulated.	2	2.6	1
Accessory buildings should not be allowed as a residence.	1	1.3	0.5
Minimum parcel size and maximum site coverage should be a consideration for some uses.	1	1.3	0.5
Relax restrictions on environmental reserves and allow reasonable usage of adjoining land.	1	1.3	0.5
Requirement for neighbour input on developments.	1	1.3	0.5
If Leduc County allows Industrial / Agriculture Resource District (IAR) the area roads should be pothole and dust controlled by the County not the farmer where the traffic goes by.	1	1.3	0.5
There should be regulations, fines and no permanent parking for recreation vehicle (R.V.) usage on rural properties.	1	1.3	0.5
Limit the size of accessory buildings.	1	1.3	0.5
Add a provision for dust control.	1	1.3	0.5
No 5G towers allowed.	1	1.3	0.5
Total	77	100	38.5

Urban living and the Vistas

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Protect Blackmud Creek and make it an environmental protection district.	3	20	1.5
Wanted orderly development with contiguous and staged development from the Nisku Business Park into Blackmud Creek, North Vistas, South Vistas and East Vistas.	2	13.2	1
Wanted schools in the East Vistas.	2	13.2	1
Services need to be close to urban areas.	1	6.7	0.5
Have residential development and a mix of land uses planned for the County.	1	6.7	0.5
Have unsightly property standards.	1	6.7	0.5
Have setbacks to allow for snow removal.	1	6.7	0.5
Require consultation and notification with property owners.	1	6.7	0.5
Keep provisions of the cancelled ASP withheld to North Vista (NV) and South Vista (SV).	1	6.7	0.5
Have an online list of active permits.	1	6.7	0.5
No 15-minute cities / communities.	1	6.7	0.5
Total	15	100	7.5

New Sarepta

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Infrastructure improvements such as signage, crosswalks, street lighting and culverts.	7	44	3.5
Recreation facilities: walking trails, increased park space, outdoor rink and ball diamond repairs.	3	19	1.5
Stand-alone library.	3	19	1.5
Have more marketing to encourage development.	1	6	0.5
Allow more commercial development when population increases.	1	6	0.5
Leave Yardley Jones Park alone.	1	6	0.5
Total	16	100	8

Lakeside Living

Comments	Number of comments	Percentage of section	Percentage overall
Building footprint restrictions on lakeside lots including increasing building heights, allowing more ground area.	8	44.4	4
Want regulation of short-term rentals.	3	16.6	1.5
Do not want to allow short-term rentals.	2	11	1
Regulate lot drainage.	1	5.6	0.5
Regulate tree clearing.	1	5.6	0.5
Allow for more trails.	1	5.6	0.5
Follow the Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan.	1	5.5	0.5
Add Lake Watershed District designation for Coal Lake and Environmentally Significant Area designation.	1	5.6	0.5
Total	18	100	9

What we've been working on

Following phase two of public participation, staff have been reading through and categorizing the comments and feedback concerning the overall vision and direction for the Land Use Bylaw. The feedback received will help with the continued drafting of the LUB update as they move toward achieving the project goals.

Staff have also been working on the new templates for the LUB update, which will result in a more user-friendly document. Staff have started drafting regulations and land use districts for agricultural areas that will accord with the Municipal Development Plan and Regional Agricultural Master Plan.

Next steps

All feedback and comments received are being considered by staff as they continue updating the LUB and proposing the necessary amendments to achieve the goals set out for the project. This report will be presented to Council for discussion in early 2024 and will be used to help inform the continued update.

Once the updated draft is completed later in 2024, further public participation opportunities will be available prior to a public hearing and consideration for adoption. Updates will be posted to the project webpage at yoursayleduccounty.com when further information and participation opportunities are available.

Appendix A: Public feedback, suggestions and comments (verbatim)

The following pages are a compilation of all public input received through phase two engagement period, and where relevant includes comments and responses from the project team.

**Please note the questions asked in this section have been removed and are answered in the questions section of this report.*

Email submissions

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received input from four respondents via email.

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

Comment (verbatim unless otherwise noted)	Response from administration
<p>Stop putting urban development by country residential areas. I had a strong urge to capitalize every letter of that last sentence, but wanted to be more formal.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is currently happening at skyrocketing rates. Everywhere you go it's the same, stale, commercialized, and cheap feel of new development permanently ruining countless acres of farmland, destroying natural environments, and ruining the beauty and unique areas of our country, all the while rich developers rake in more profit as our beautiful heartland goes to waste.</p> <p>I am currently a resident of the North Vistas area and have an abomination of dense urban development being planned all the way to the very border of our country's residential area. An area, mind you, that has been isolated for decades, where everyone came to live here because they didn't want to live in the city or close to it. They call it the "east vistas" which is a complete joke of a name. As to be truly justified to have that name, it would have to be consistent with the vistas that are already here, and that of which are country residential, not urban.</p> <p>I wish I had the opportunity to protest Irvine Creek, a completely inconsiderate, joke of an area, but didn't know how all this worked at the time and was too busy with my life to keep up with these matters and didn't know about it till they started cutting down trees. That lot was a completely open for many years, then one day at the drop of a hat, they start tearing up the area for a level of</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback that you do not want urban development to by country residential areas and urban sprawl to be stopped.</i></p> <p><i>The urban development of the East Vistas is undertaken in accordance with the policies set out within the approved Area Structure Plan which is a guide for future development in the area.</i></p>

<p>density that isn't even close to being consistent with North Vista's nor even Lucas Estates, which shows how much these developers and planners really care about maintaining the consistency of the area.</p>	
<p>I recently attended an open house talking to us residents about the next quarter section of the east vista's plan and how it was going to be mapped out. One of their propositions was putting a gas station right on the border next to someone's property that has been a multi acre lot for years. Do you have any idea how insulting it is for developers to come in and showcase a gas station and dense urban development right next to the country view that has been that way for years and expect us to somehow be happy with that? It's insanity. It's ridiculous. Stop doing this. This is completely inconsiderate. There is such an utter excess amount of development right now, we don't need it. The commercial area wasn't even defined as to what stores will be there. Likely will be more multi-billion dollar fast food joints that continue to poison our world. Please tell me how any of this is benefiting our community and the world. I feel driven out of my home. That's the effect this poor planning is having on me, truly destroying the value of our community. Put an end to this and the east vista's plan. Leave the land alone, or make it a nature reserve, which brings me to my next point. I noticed that some of the feedback for this submission already was to add more nature park areas. Yes, do this. Don't just add a nice little 5 acre man made pond area where you can walk. Make actual nature areas that span and grow wide. Bike trails, campgrounds, walking paths, heck even plant some trees for future forest to grow. No more of these 5 little acre awful areas in the middle of an urban jungle thinking this somehow will satisfy the outdoor needs of the people. Why are national parks becoming some of the only places where nature is available? They're basically becoming museums, where now countless people flock to because they want to get away from all the urban noise and density. More and more these places will be a tourist disaster because there will be nowhere else to truly get away and feel the nature of earth, which is a <i>fundamental</i> human need. We've already seen this begin to happen as tourism in places like Lake Louise has reached their limit where they recently had to shut down the area for more people to enter as it was completely crowded. And no, a pond in an urban subdivision overlooking a sea of housing is not a</p>	<p><i>Thank you for letting us know that you would not want dense urban development as proposed in the east vista plan next to your country residential subdivision and that you would like more natural areas that are expansive and wide with bike trails, campgrounds, walking paths and trees.</i></p> <p><i>The urban development of the East Vistas is undertaken in accordance with the policies set out within the approved Area Structure Plan which is a guide for future development in the area.</i></p>

<p>satisfactory nature placement to satisfy, we need a vast amount more of nature areas for people to go and the housing to nature ratio is completely out of balance.</p> <p>We came to the country here 26 years ago for a reason. Stop allowing the city to come to us.</p>	
<p><i>Excerpt: Leduc County LUB and MDP (Interim) Review; Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) – Alberta Operations Submission</i></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input for the development of Leduc County’s updated MDP and LUB. The County’s process on public engagement and appreciation for environmental considerations is appreciated.</p> <p>Alberta’s wetlands and grasslands have been disappearing from the provincial landscape for over 150 years. In southern Alberta, up to 70% of wetlands and the benefits they provide have been lost to urban expansion, agricultural management practices and infrastructure development. Wetlands are essential natural assets that provide multiple benefits to Counties in a very cost effective and sustainable manner. These benefits, known as ecosystem services, include flood and drought mitigation, water quality improvement, carbon sequestration, groundwater recharge, biodiversity, and cultural and recreational use. These benefits are being increasingly recognized and incorporated into government and industry priorities at all levels.</p> <p>Balancing social and environmental goals in a context of increasing development pressure is complicated but can be done. The County is encouraged to consider the following comments to help ensure natural areas are protected for the benefit of service delivery and (future) residents.</p> <p>Draft Land Use Bylaw Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider clarifying the definition of water body to explicitly include wetlands (currently only the classes swamp and marsh are mentioned). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o E.g. Strathcona County: <i>WATER BODY means any location where water flows or is present, whether or not the flow or the presence of water</i> 	<p><i>Thank you for the information on the importance and benefits that Alberta’s wetlands and grasslands have on our ecosystem and the need to prioritize and protect our natural areas. In addition, the input on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the need to clarify the definition of water body to explicitly include wetlands;</i> • <i>incorporating existing wetlands into all areas of planning and development specifically in zoning, subdivisions and development.</i> <p><i>We appreciate the specific input into all the areas listed in your submission.</i></p>

<p><i>is continuous, intermittent or occurs only during a flood, and includes but is not limited to wetlands and aquifers as defined by the Water Act.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Or include a separate definition of wetlands such as (set out in the Alberta Wetland Policy): <i>Wetlands are land saturated with water long enough to promote formation of water altered soils, growth of water tolerant vegetation, and various kinds of biological activity that are adapted to the wet environment.</i> <p>For the following comments a goal is to incorporate existing wetlands into all planning and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding zoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider further integrating tools at municipal disposal to preserve natural areas including wetlands. Review opportunities for utilization of open space districts, direct control districts, rezoning, downzoning for this purpose into the Land Use Bylaw. - Regarding subdivisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For new application require proponents provide information to accurately identify wetlands on site or adjacent to the site including relevant information to flooding. ○ For clarity it is recommended to set out that the County will require maximum allowable Municipal / Environmental Reserve in relation to wetlands (and other environmentally sensitive areas) as well as any further conditions. ○ Research integration of the use of conservation easements into the bylaw to allow for a greater scope of protection of natural areas. - Regarding development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review setback requirements to ensure alignment with current evidence-based guidelines on setbacks from wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas and establish minimum setback distances from wetlands. ○ Prohibit disturbance or impact of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas. 	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>Overall, I support the changes to make the proposed Land Use Bylaw more user-friendly, however in the quest to reduce and simplify the language, I believe some pertinent information has been eliminated. Since the Land Use Bylaw is the “rule book” that guides decisions on planning applications, equally as important for those considering development as well as those who may be impacted by it, it must be clear and as complete as possible while at the same time leaving out information that is redundant.</p>	<p><i>Thanks for your feedback to keep the Land Use Bylaw user-friendly, eliminate redundancy while making sure all the necessary and pertinent information is not eliminated so it provides guidance on planning applications.</i></p> <p><i>If you wish to discuss the information you believe has been removed from the Land Use Bylaw please contact Planning and Development.</i></p>
<p>My changes in red are suggestions that I feel will help to clarify and/or in my opinion better state the intent of the bylaw. Where there are blanks, I don’t have any suggested changes at this time. I have changed the order of some sections to better reflect the connection between certain sections. There appears to be a numbering error making it very difficult to understand what is intended so have taken the liberty to renumber in a manner that I believe to be correct.</p> <p>Part 1: Introduction</p> <p>1 Purpose</p> <p>1.1 The purpose of this Bylaw is to regulate and control the development and use of lands and buildings in the County in order to achieve orderly and economic development in accordance with the vision and policies of the Municipal Development Plan and other applicable statutory plans.</p> <p>1.2 This Bylaw, amongst other matters:</p> <p>b) Prescribes a method for reviewing and making decisions on development permit applications and issuing development permits;</p> <p>2 Effective Date & Transition</p> <p>3 Compliance with Legislation – Since this Bylaw references other County Bylaws, suggest providing links to or information on how to access these Bylaws.</p> <p>6 Fees & Charges</p> <p>6.1 All fees and charges Bylaw XX-XX</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your specific edits in the bylaw to help clarify the intent of the bylaw and the connection between certain sections.</i></p>

<p>7 Definition of Terms – to be completed</p> <p>Part 2: Planning Authorities</p> <p>1 Development Authority</p> <p>2 Development Officer</p> <p>2.1 A Development Officer is any person designated through the Chief Administrative Officer ... The previous Bylaw states: shall be filled by a person or persons appointed by Council. What is the reason for this change?</p> <p>3. Appeal Authority – This is where some reference to an Appeal Authority should be added since any reference to an Appeal Board is proposed much later in the document. (see s.4.17 and all of Part 4: Appeals). This would help to put the Appeal Authority in a better context.</p> <p>Part 3: Development Process</p> <p>1 Development Requiring a Permit</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.2 No development and/or use of lands and buildings shall commence prior to the effect date delineated within a valid development permit Suggest a reference to Section 4.17 Commencement of Development and possibly Part 6: Enforcement be included here to emphasize the importance of this section.</p> <p>2 Development Not Requiring a Permit – to be completed</p> <p>3 Development Permit Application Requirements</p> <p>3.1 A submission for a development permit application shall include at a minimum, the following information, unless any omissions have been explicitly agreed in writing between the Development Authority and applicant;</p> <p>d) A Site Plan, completed in accordance with the relevant development permit application package (what is included in this package?), as may be amended</p>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

from time to time and shall include as a minimum:

- i) north arrow
- ii) adjacent roads and highways
- iii) existing and proposed vehicle accesses
- iv) rights-of-ways and easements
- v) water courses and drainage
- vi) location, identification and dimensions of existing and proposed buildings and structures
- vii) site dimensions and distances from property lines to proposed development

3.2 Each application shall include the **abovementioned** information, unless any omissions have been explicitly agreed in writing between the Development Authority and applicant. (Is there a need for this exception if all application are intended to be treated the same?)

4 Application Process This section is one of great importance and must be clear enough to help people understand how a decision is rendered. This will go a long way to ensure transparency in the process, therefore a shortened version is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to separating the Development Process from the Application Process (add Part 4: Application Process and obviously renumbering the balance of this section) since it is important that they each stand alone.

4.4 Request for Additional Information Suggest this section be switched with 4.4 so that any information is that is required is provided prior to an application refusal.

4.4.1 Notwithstanding . . .

4.6 Referrals & Notifications - Why has the referral process prior to making a decision been removed from this section? This is a major shift from the existing bylaw (see 3.4.2 of the existing bylaw) and one that is vitally important for a discretionary use. To

combine Referrals and Notice of Decision takes the intent out of context and should be separated.

It is the only way an adjacent landowner or anyone who may be affected by a proposal can table their concerns before a decision is made.

4.6.1 Referral of Application - This section should state that notification of adjacent landowners **SHALL** be sent for any discretionary use and all applications in a direct control district (see 3.4.2 of current Bylaw). To suggest that removal of this requirement will result in a more efficient circulation process is not only short-sited but is also incorrect.

- a) Adjacent landowners
- b) Direct Control
- c) Adjacent Municipalities
- d) Intermunicipal Plan
- e) Other Bodies and Organizations

5 Decision Making – There appears to be a numbering issue, have offered suggestions to provide clarity.

5.2 Discretionary use(s) - Section 3.5 Discretion of the Development Authority has been removed and is a major shift from the existing bylaw. This should be included to make it clear what considerations are given to a discretionary use. To suggest this will allow for more decision-making flexibility to Development Officers causes me great concern especially when there is nothing that states what **SHALL** be considered when processing an application (see Section 3.5 of the existing bylaw)

5.2.1

- b) “conditions of approval” need to be defined
- c) “conditions of approval” need to be defined

5.3 Conditions of a Development Approval – suggest this section be moved from 4.15 to be included in the Decision Making

	<p>process section since any conditions are pertinent to the decision itself. Further, since non-compliance is often an issue, reference to monitoring and enforcement should be included in this section.</p> <p>5.3.1 The Development Authority may impose any conditions . . .</p> <p>5.4 Neither a Permitted Discretionary Use</p> <p>5.5 Variance of the Land Use Bylaw The exclusion of the wording from Section 3.6.2 of the existing bylaw is a significant deviation - Is the intent to remove reference to Bylaw 12-09?</p> <p>5.5.1 The Development Authority may issue . . .</p> <p>5.5.2 A request for a variance . . .</p> <p>5.5.3 Any application that includes . . .</p> <p>5.6 Notice of Decision - there appears to be a numbering issue, have offered suggestions to provide clarity. This should be more appropriately identified as Notice of Decision rather than Referral of Decision.</p> <p>5.7 Development Agreements, Securities & Caveats Commencement of Development</p> <p>5.8.1 Any discretionary development . . . includes first reference to appeal board which should be included in Part 2.</p> <p>5.8.2 Where an appeal has been formally submitted . . .</p> <p>5.8.3 In any circumstance where . . . will there be any consideration of a penalty for development that has commenced prior to approval of a permit?</p> <p>5.8.4 Any permitted development . . .</p> <p>5.9 Completion of Development - what is the intent behind this section?</p> <p>5.10 Expiry of Development Permit</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>5.10.1 A development Permit shall be considered expired, and no longer in effect, when;</p> <p>a) need to define “to the satisfaction of the County”</p> <p>5.11 Cancellation or Suspension of a Development Permit</p> <p>5.12 Extension of a Development Permit - there appears to be a numbering issue so have offered suggestions to provide clarity.</p> <p>5.12.1 Extensions of the following may be permitted in respect to a permitted use:</p> <p>5.12.2 Extensions of the following shall not be permitted in respect to a discretionary use:</p> <p>5.12.4 Any extension granted under Part 3, s.5.12.1 or Part 3, s.5.12.3 shall be undertaken . . .</p> <p>5.13 Reapplication for a Development Permit</p> <p>5.13.1</p> <p>5.13.2</p> <p>5.14 Amendment of a Development Permit</p> <p>5.14.1</p> <p>5.14.2</p> <p>5.15 Non-conforming Buildings and Non-conforming Use</p> <p>Part 4: Appeals</p> <p>1 Development Appeals</p> <p>1.1 reference to appeal board which should be included in Part 2</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b) does this include any approval of a development permit, permitted or discretionary, that are subject to conditions?</p> <p>c)</p> <p>d)</p> <p>1.2 How would an affected person become aware of a pending application if there is no referral process for that application?</p>	
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>Part 5: Enforcement Since Enforcement appears to pertain to development and not an amendment to the bylaw, suggest moving this to become Part 5, followed by Part 6: Amendment of the Land Use Bylaw.</p> <p>Part 6: Amendment of the Land Use Bylaw</p> <p>If I have totally missed the mark when it comes to numbering, wording or order, I do apologize. If my suggestions are not clear, I would be more than happy to provide clarification. I am assuming that changes to Definition of Terms, Development Not Requiring a Permit, General Regulations and District Regulations will be provided in draft form for comment.</p>	
<p>Do you have any comments on the information in the Nisku Business Park and business section?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Nisku Business Park has suffered from changes to the economy in the past and would benefit from an aggressive marketing campaign for the future. There doesn't appear to be any strategies to encourage business to locate here. 2. It appears Direct Control has become the norm and not the exception within the Nisku Business Park. Without the benefit of knowing what districts would be included makes it difficult to comment on this section. 3. It makes sense to reduce the number of specific land uses in the Industrial and Business Park areas however only after the new districts have been created. 4. It makes sense to reduce the number of discretionary uses by increasing the number of permitted uses in the industrial and commercial districts thereby shortening the timeline for processing applications. 5. It may make sense to include general regulations and regulations pertaining to specific land uses in the industrial and commercial districts be included in each of those districts and not included in the General Regulations section. 6. There is no area to comment on the South of Devon Area Structure Plan or where this is to be included in the Land Use Bylaw. 	<p><i>Thank you for your input and questions on: the tax rate in the Nisku Business park, Direct Control, Business Park districts, decreasing discretionary uses, increasing permitted uses, having general regulations on specific land uses in the industrial and commercial districts section and about the where the Devon Area Structure Plan will be included in the plan.</i></p>

<p>Do you have any comments on the information in the urban living and the Vistas section?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is nice to see more typically residential development and a mix of land uses planned for the County although have some concerns about the cost of urban standards for this area. 2. Consideration should be given to a Community Standards Bylaw that addresses in some way all unsightly properties regardless of where they are located in the County. 	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback and questions on residential and mixed land use, concerns about urban standards area, urban town centre, higher urban standards, and about how unsightly properties would be addressed throughout the County.</i></p>
<p>Do you have any comments on the information in the agricultural section?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There needs to be a bigger conversation about the permitted and discretionary uses listed in the current Land Use Bylaw. Minimum parcel size and maximum site coverage should be a consideration for some uses. 2. The inclusion of a personal storage building without the requirement of a principal dwelling is a slippery slope and one that needs a lot more discussion if this is to be included in the bylaw. It should be made clear that these buildings are not to be used for residential purposes at all and there must be some protection from them being converted to house any kind of business if it is approved as for personal storage. 3. Increasing the floor area of accessory buildings allowed in the permitted use category is a good idea since it is probably occurring and is not being monitored or enforced anyway. 4. Increasing the maximum size of a home-based business in accessory buildings is a topic that must occur when discussing Home Based Businesses in general – such as potential rezoning, minimum parcel size, number of employees, etc. 5. Agritourism and on-farm diversified uses should be discussed with other uses in the rural area that can attract large numbers of people such as wedding venues and agricultural events in order to be clear about what is intended on these sites. 6. Since the Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional District limits residential uses, does it make sense to increase the number of dwelling units permitted. All above mentioned concerns also apply to this district. 	<p><i>Thanks for your input on permitted and discretionary uses, parcel size, personal storage not being permitted without a principal dwelling, increasing floor area of accessory buildings, maximum size of home-based businesses, agritourism and on-farm diversified uses and number of dwellings allowed as it pertains to Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional District.</i></p>

<p>Do you have any comments on the information in the other topics section?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a good idea to include Subdivision as a specific section under the Land Use Bylaw since they often go together and uses may or may not be compatible. 2. New Sarepta, as a growth hamlet, would benefit from an aggressive marketing plan since there is so much potential for development. 	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback about having a separate section for Subdivision in the Land Use Bylaw and the benefit a marketing plan would have in attracting development to the hamlet of New Sarepta.</i></p>
<p>Now, specifically in regards to L.U.B. input; the same theme "<i>protecting agriculture and promoting appropriate agricultural uses</i>" continues to resonate. While this is once again encouraging to read, in reality it's not what has been done in the county as evidenced by my earlier reference. It should be noted that although the documents suggest the focus should be on prime agricultural land, the comments from the first 3 open houses don't support that. There were too many alleged comments that "residents wanted environmental" changes. Either the scope wasn't streamlined to maintain focus on agricultural lands and comments were inputted to serve another agenda such as climate hysteria? I'd like to suggest whatever governance has been put in place for Watershed and Wetland @ 2013 be reviewed. It's impact on lands within rural property development is a little too heavy handed. While there is understanding for preserving these areas intended to be protected, this can also be done by relaxing reasonable uses of these areas. It seems an indiscriminating boundary is being designated as environmental reserve which prohibits any activity within those areas. I recall intentional language was being considered during the Saunders lake area structure plan to promote trails and non-intrusive exploration within these environmental reserves? I know 2 family member who recently purchased rural properties which prior to their purchasing the land, had no restrictions attached. Now during the subdivision process, unreasonable restrictions have been imposed. Perhaps we are missing something, but property owners should be permitted reasonable usage of these lands adjoining their property. Trails, accessing to water, grazing etc.. There also has to be something considered to the fact land owners could help control tree growth or fallen trees in part as a fire prevention effort.</p> <p>Given the backlash Thorhild (or others) experienced during attempted L.U.B. review and</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback on relaxing restrictions and allowing reasonable usage of land adjoining their property and the concern over land use restrictions because of environmental reserve.</i></p>

implementations. I trust such suggestions never occur at Leduc County or any farmland areas where we have to apply for a permit to erect a fence for livestock on our property or be prevented from using barbed staples or any other such foolishness.	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Mailed submissions

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received input from zero respondents via mail.

Open house comments

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received 178 comments via the feedback boards, comments captured by staff and comment forms at our series of five open houses.

Question: What do you think of the overall vision we've shared for the bylaw so far?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
To simplify our current bylaws, making them more user friendly to read and comprehend. To not increase regulation, permits but simplify reduce.	<i>Thank you for your feedback to make the bylaw more user friendly and easier to read, along with not increasing regulations and permits needed.</i>
Overall enjoying the agricultural reserve being protected for generations to COME 😊	<i>Thank you for your input on the agricultural reserve.</i>
Semi trucks need to be not only limited to the side of the street of Flying J, they should also not be parked alongside the only entrance/exit to Centre Street.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on where trucks should be allowed to park. We will advise our Road Operations of this concern.</i>
Seems like a good plan. Big job but needs to be done. Good start with the open houses	<i>Thank you for your feedback.</i>
Happy to see 15 year old bylaws are being reviewed to align with today's environmental concerns. Our interest is in with the lakeside uses. The current bylaw has height restrictions which makes cabin owners cover more of their lot. Building up rather than out is much more environment friendly leaving more ground for water/nutrient absorption to keep Leduc County lakes healthy.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on allowing an increase on height of buildings in lake area to leave for more ground for water and nutrient absorption in order to maintain the health of the lake.</i>

Station: Administrative and process	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Always in favor of streamline and efficient process. But not at the expense of reasonable and appropriate review and approvals.	<i>Thank you for your feedback that there should be streamlined and efficient process while still having reasonable and appropriate reviews and approvals.</i>
Treat, always, each request as an individual. Bend when needed.	<i>Thanks for your input to treat each request individually.</i>
Wizard Lake Water Shed Area: more ATV, UTV, motorcycle trails; walking trails.	<i>Thanks for your input on allowing more trails for multiple uses in the Wizard Lake Water Shed area.</i>
Allow small animals i.e. chickens in Country Residential	<i>Thanks for your input to allow small animals such as chickens in Country residential.</i>
Entry on land only with consent	<i>Thank you for your input about only allowing entry to land with consent.</i>
The Land Use Bylaw should have provisions to delegate power to the Council or administration to vary/deviate from set MDP/ASP provided the project is favourable to the community or economic conditions dictate otherwise. There should be a simplified procedure to have Council review projects that might not fall within the definition of a particular ASP/MDP.	<i>Thank you for your feedback. This can be accommodated through an amendment to these stat documents. The Municipal Government Act does not allow Councils to amend these documents outside of a public process, and significant amendments must go through the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board.</i>
Provincial fines? No thanks calm down – Please! NOT welcome to come and verify anything! Shame	<i>Thanks for your feedback about fines and verifying compliance.</i>
Provincial fees no thank you. Entry by consent.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about only having entry to land with consent and no provincial fees.</i>
Entry on land only with reasonable consent and notice from Enforcement. County should retain fines/enforcement in-house without the need to defer to the Province.	<i>Thanks for your input about reasonable consent and notice from enforcement to enter land and that the county should retain the fines in-house.</i>
Authority MUST have approval to enter property and can NOT come unannounced “verify”	<i>Thank you for your input that it must be announced and authority must have approval to enter property.</i>
Please ensure all green spaces show on all lots	<i>Thanks for your feedback about green space on lots.</i>

When an infraction is may have occurred permission MUST be granted by Landowner to enter property!	<i>Thanks for your input that there must be landowner permission to enter property.</i>
Concern with the addition of fines (planner explained purpose, seemed less concerned after)	<i>Thanks for sharing your concern over addition of fines.</i>
Support for fines	<i>Thanks for your input on supporting fines.</i>
Penalties for non-compliance and ignoring LU approvals are CRITICAL including “effective” enforcement – removal where warranted and penalties.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about the importance of penalties and enforcement for non-compliance.</i>
If DC districts are used for the “particular” control sb documented to ensure future development is aligned with the DC reason i.e. Haliburton	<i>Thanks for your feedback that direct control districts should be documented to ensure future development is aligned.</i>
Define Park Model	<i>Thanks for your feedback that there needs to be a defined park model.</i>
Residents of NV, SV and others next to significant development need to be consulted early in the process when they will be impacted (i.e. subdivision approval of property next to Davidson Drive effects ALL residents along BMC.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about the need to have consultation early in the process when landowners will be impacted by subdivision approval. Subdivision applications are processed and referred out in accordance with the Municipal Government Act and Subdivision of Land Regulation.</i>
Blackmud Creek ASP has been cancelled. However – this ASP made provisions to the NV, SV that still need to be kept. Ones that should be promises considered both north and south of that ASP.	<i>Thanks for your input for the need to keep provisions of the cancelled Area Structure Plan (ASP) withheld to North Vista (NV) and South Vista (SV). The Blackmud Creek ASP is still in effect and the policies within it continue to be upheld.</i>
Please keep some areas as agricultural.	<i>Thanks for the feedback to keep agricultural areas.</i>
Environmental protection of creeks (BMC) etc. wetland and lake is VERY important.	<i>Thank you for the input for environmental protection of creeks, wetlands and lakes.</i>
Recreation zone bylaws restrict building height to 6 ft with only 10 per cent of second story useable. This causes owners to cover larger areas with buildings, reducing the amount of land that is permeable. Bad for the lakes. Needs a rethink.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about the recreation zone bylaw and the need to allow higher building heights to reduce the area covered by buildings.</i>
Please keep ½ mile on each side of blackmud creek through North and South at Environmental Reserve or BP level i.e. “clean”.	<i>Thanks for the input to have environmental reserve or Business Park (BP) level for Blackmud Creek.</i>
There is a need to ensure all existing land use are put in line with environmental protection and BP LU i.e. Tubescope land for sale.	<i>Thanks for the input for ensuring all existing land uses are aligned with environmental protection and Business Park (BP).</i>

I am very happy with the consultation process for the LUB.	<i>Thanks for letting us know you are happy with the consultation.</i>
Lots of info and lots of reading but really clear and well done! No concerns with what is proposed 😊	<i>Thanks for your feedback.</i>

Station: Nisku Business Park and business	
Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response from administration
Better staged development in Nisku	<i>Thank you for your input about wanting better staged development.</i>
Fill central Nisku before developing North Nisku.	<i>Thank you for your input on how Nisku should be filled.</i>
More attraction 10-15 min from airport to keep people in County for business.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about having more attraction within 10 to 15 minutes from the airport.</i>
In talking with a representative tonight, the streamlining and openness to business and future manufacturing is going in the right direction	<i>Thanks for the feedback about the openness and streamlining business and future manufacturing.</i>
Keep it environmentally responsible please clean up is the businesses GOAL...ongoing...	<i>Thank you for your feedback about keeping the Nisku area environmentally responsible.</i>
Public transportation needed in the whole Nisku area. No bike lanes, but bussing needed.	<i>Thanks for the input about the need for public transit and busing.</i>
Landscaping in Nisku not too much! But similar to City of Leduc.	<i>Thank you for the feedback to have some landscaping in Nisku.</i>
No urban or industrial approval east of Spine Road to the east of Nisku hold off for 20 years.	<i>Thank you for your input about no industrial or urban development east of the Spine Road.</i>
The landscaping being seen in new developments in North Nisku is noted and appreciated.	<i>Thank you for the feedback on the landscaping with new developments in North Nisku.</i>
The design and look of Nisku's latest developments is beautiful.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on the design of the latest Nisku developments.</i>
Support for NO discretionary referrals in Nisku.	<i>Thank you for your input on no discretionary referrals.</i>
Goals of the districts "prohibit development of industrial land uses that are inappropriate and	<i>Thank you for your feedback that districts should prohibit development that is inappropriate and</i>

incompatible with residential land uses and ENVIRONMENTAL protection of BMC.	<i>incompatible with residential land uses and environmental protection.</i>
Heavy industrial needs to be well defined to ensure inappropriate businesses do not see N ASP for opportunities i.e. Halliburton	<i>Thanks for your feedback to have a definition for heavy industrial to ensure compatible and appropriate business in Nisku Area Structure Plan.</i>
Direct Control areas should be more aligned with Business Park (i.e. similar to BC ASP)	<i>Thank you for your input that Direct Control districts should be aligned with the Business Park.</i>
Spine Road has add a lot to the betterment of this area plan	<i>Thank you for your feedback about the value of the Spine Road as brought to the area.</i>

Station: Urban living and the Vistas	
Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response from administration
Wants to protect ag lands near east vistas and Devon.	<i>Thank you for sharing your input to protect the agricultural land near the East Vistas and Devon.</i>
I do believe providing services closer to urban areas is good planning.	<i>Thanks for the feedback that you believe providing services closer to urban areas is good planning.</i>
Please make it as simple as possible to add a 'granny suite', a separate residence on an acreage	Thank you for your input that it should be made as simple as possible to add a secondary suite or a separate residence to an acreage.
Suites should remain discretionary use. Survey the neighbors!	Thanks for your feedback that suites should be discretionary and neighbors should be surveyed.
The wildlife will be impacted! Sad.	<i>Thank you for sharing your concern about the impact to wildlife.</i>
East Vistas please ensure schools will be many children needing a place to go.	<i>Thank you for your input that schools should be located in the East Vistas.</i>
The builders feel they will be able to take care of the "water", it is vital that sewage does not end up in Blackmud Creek.	<i>Thank you for sharing your input that sewage should not be allowed to go into Blackmud Creek.</i>
No 15 minute Communities/cities. Isn't 23,000 people too many for 1,400 acres. No multi family sites.	Thanks for your input on no multi-family sites. As a rural municipality, Leduc County has not adopted a 15-minute community approach. This is an urban planning practice that is not used in rural settings.

Environmental Protection District in Blackmud area (floodplane) with only public utilities as a use.	Thank you for your feedback that only public utilities should be allowed in the flood plain to protect the Blackmud area.
Online list of active permits would be beneficial for landowners who aren't immediately adjacent.	<i>Thanks for the feedback to have an online list of active permits.</i>
Too many small lots being seen; not reflection of County lots.	<i>Thank you for your feedback that there are too many small lots.</i>
Too many houses on lots being seen.	<i>Thanks for your feedback that there are too many houses on lots.</i>
We need to be on top of new schools NOW in Vistas for growing community	<i>Thank you for your input on the need to have schools in the Vistas.</i>
Please keep acreage developments off farmland. We need to protect our farms and farmers.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on keeping acreage development off farmland.</i>

Station: Agriculture	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Pressure ag land – home-based businesses small chemicals on ag lands! Should be known.	<i>Thanks for your feedback about home-based businesses and chemicals on agricultural lands.</i>
Small acreages (<5 ac) should be permitted a second dwelling (eg. in-law suite).	<i>Thank you for your input that small acreages with less than 5 acres should be allow a second dwelling.</i>
Residents from other counties have reported the introduction of new limits on the type and number of small farm animals permitted on small acreages. Do not introduce similar arbitrary limits here. Having a variety of foraging and browsing/grazing animals (chickens, turkeys, geese, goats, sheep, alpacas etc) is a vital component of permaculture farming, an environmentally-friendly and sustainable system that relies on synergy between varieties of plants and animals. It is suitable for both small and large scale systems.	<i>Thank you for sharing your input that you would like the ability to have small farm animals permitted on small acreages.</i>
Flexibility in animals: chickens, turkeys, small goats; smaller personal use 3-5 acres.	<i>Thanks for your feedback that you would like to be able to have animals allowed on acreages of three to five acres.</i>
Reasonable outbuildings allowed - not permit regulated/taxed e.g. 20x30 shop, tractors, quads,	<i>Thank you for sharing your input that reasonable outbuildings should not be regulated or taxed.</i>

sleds, etc. and additional greenhouse, workshop, etc.	
Allow/modular (in-law) home on properties in addition to main residence 3-5 acres.	<i>Thanks for your input on allowing in-law homes on properties of three to five acres.</i>
Clause in the Bylaws allowing GRANDFATHERING of existing agriculture to be exempt from current (new) Bylaws i.e. buildings/operations/etc.	<i>Thanks for the input to allow for grandfathering of existing agricultural buildings.</i>
Leave home-based business size as is.	<i>Thank you for your input to keep home-based business size as is.</i>
Do not allow any more good farm land #1 soil being taken west of Leduc or any other location.	<i>Thanks for sharing that you want to keep good farmland.</i>
Put people and food first. Don't need more land for industrial use.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about not allowing more industrial use.</i>
As Leduc County has the privilege of having EIA in our County, more planning around the future of tourism and prepare land use bylaw that support tourism opportunities. Agritourism, food tourism and eco-tourism are huge under-developed markets that should be forecasted and supported given our unique location and opportunity with the airport. Being an agricultural powerhouse in AB, agri-tourism and food tourism will attract new visitors and residents to our County.	<i>Thank you for your input that the County should do more planning for various forms of tourism such as agritourism, food tourism and eco-tourism.</i>
It would be nice to allow a garden suite larger than 700 sq. ft. on an acreage less than 4.9 acres (we have 4.54) in an agricultural area.	<i>Thank you for your input to allow extra suite on acreages of less than 4.9 acres</i>
No 5G towers.	<i>Thank you for your input on 5G towers.</i>
Keep the number of dwelling units permitted as is.	<i>Thank you for your input on the number of permitted dwelling units.</i>
Allow storage sheds without dwellings e.g. on land that's spread out.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on allowing storage sheds on lands that do not have a dwelling on it.</i>
Limit the size [of accessory buildings]	<i>Thanks for your feedback on limiting the size of accessory buildings.</i>
If Leduc County allows IAR in the area then the roads should be pothole and dust controlled by the County not by the farmer that all the traffic goes by.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about having pothole and dust control in Industrial Agricultural Resource Districts.</i>
Grandfathering of existing building structures etc. to be exempt of future bylaws.	<i>Thanks for your input on grandfathering existing buildings and structures from future bylaws.</i>
Ag tourism – futuristic in AG district as a farmer. Not just hayrides. Attracts Amazon work[ers] to stay a. Farm to table, brewery on-farm b. Stay at horse farm	<i>Thank you for your feedback on agritourism.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Olive farm d. Food processing tours e. Overnight stays f. Bus tours taking different stops g. Value-added, vertical integration 	
More freedom in personal choices of owned farm sites including secondary properties, personal businesses, and agri-tourism.	<i>Thank you for your input on allowing more freedom for personal choice on owned farm sites for secondary properties, personal businesses, and agritourism.</i>
Absolutely allow a storage building without a dwelling!	<i>Thanks for your input on allowing storage building without a dwelling.</i>
Allow small set-ups or volunteer (eg. R.V. storage for friends and family), home Bible studies, home churches, etc. Home-based business, market gardens, R.V. storage, kennel, religious activity.	<i>Thank you for your input on allowing a variety of small operations for home-based business, market gardens, R.V. storage, kennel, and religious activity.</i>
For all ag districts, include specific minimum setbacks from water. As established in LUB 07-08 to include permanent water bodies, creeks, streams, and wetlands.	<i>Thank you for your input to have minimum setbacks from water.</i>
I like the general direction to relax rules around secondary suites, secondary houses, storage, and small business.	<i>Thanks for the input on wanting the rules relaxed to allow for secondary suites, secondary houses, storage, and small business.</i>
Multiple acreage development puts stress on existing aquifers.	<i>Thank you for your input regarding the stress that multiple acreage developments can put on aquifers.</i>
Run-off from farms is an ongoing issue creating stress on existing creeks, etc.	<i>Thanks for sharing your concern over run-off from farms creating stress on existing creeks.</i>
There should be clear cut rules on R.V. usage on rural properties. They should not be setting up R.V.'s permanently for long-term recreational usage. Fines need to be in place.	<i>Thank you for your input on having rules and fines for RV storage and not allowing permanent long-term recreation usage.</i>
Continue to allow small-scale livestock without permits.	<i>Thanks for your input to allow small-scale livestock without permits.</i>
Recommend protection of healthy vegetation and ESA, waterbodies and wetlands.	<i>Thank you for your input to protect healthy vegetation, waterbodies and wetlands.</i>
Require development permits for clearing, stripping, grading, or excavation of land for agricultural purposes.	<i>Thanks for your feedback to require development permits for clearing of land for agricultural purposes.</i>
Ag/Country Residential TD – questioning development permit for 'market garden'. Particularly small operations with under 10 cars visiting a yard per day. Perhaps needs to be better worded.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on not needing a permit for a market garden if there are less than 10 cars a day.</i>

Rethink how development permits are issued. Be tough right at the outset as to what is allowed. Follow up during to ensure the business is actually doing what they applied for.	<i>Thanks for the input on being strict on what is allowed with development permits and having follow up with the business.</i>
Discretionary uses need to be very clear that this could or should require neighbor input, not just DA.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on discretionary uses and the need for neighbor input and not just the development authority.</i>
Enforce development permits especially when someone intentionally builds on neighbors property lines with expectation to gain the land instead of being forced to remove due to illegal action.	<i>Thank you for your input on enforcing development permits.</i>
Very important. Block development on prime agricultural land!	<i>Thanks for your input to block development on prime agricultural land.</i>
No development on prime farmland.	<i>Thanks for your feedback to not allow development on prime agricultural land.</i>
Allow small farms more opportunities to be economically viable – AirBnB, ecotourism, agritourism, more help and less obstacles. Cost of \$1,000 to book at other uses is too high. Help with business plans instead of barriers.	<i>Thanks for your feedback to allow small farms more business opportunities such as Airbnb, ecotourism and agritourism.</i>
I'm very impressed with the RAMP documents and land classification.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on Regional Agriculture Master Plan and land classification.</i>
No – other than save our farmland to feed Canadians. Sadly Strathcona County is selling rich soil farmland to developers for urban sprawl. 😞	<i>Thanks for the feedback on saving farmland.</i>

Station: Other topics (subdivision, natural resource extraction, Genesee overlay)	
<i>Comment (verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response from administration
Home-based businesses should provide list of chemicals being used.	<i>Thanks for you input about getting list of chemicals used by home-based businesses.</i>
As a Leduc County acreage owner it is important to keep our land use freedom and flexibility in mind when developing or updating land use by-laws.	<i>Thank you for your input that the County should keep the current freedom and flexibility of land use in mind when updating the bylaw.</i>

More green spaces with parking for people to enjoy.	<i>Thanks for your input on having more green space and parking.</i>
I feel that Leduc County should implement a community standards bylaw. Many of us who take pride in ownership of our land and acreages are disgusted and disappointed to see that others let their properties become eyesores with derelict buildings and accumulated junk vehicles. I fully support the idea of implementing some type of bylaw to reduce the number of junkyard type properties throughout the region.	<i>Thanks for your feedback to implement a community standards bylaw to address derelict buildings and accumulated junk.</i>
Tourism – design buildings to reduce noise and lands to reduce impacts.	<i>Thanks for your input on the design of buildings and land to reduce noise and impacts.</i>
Eco-tourism – glamping, tents, mitigate/minimize noise rise.	<i>Thank you for your input to allow for eco-tourism and to minimize / mitigate noise.</i>
Strict noise regulations for companies building outside of Nisku.	<i>Thanks for your feedback about strict noise regulations for companies building outside of Nisku.</i>
To add a provision for dust control.	<i>Thanks for the feedback to include dust control provision into the bylaw.</i>
NOT MISINFORMATION this is all climate change agenda!!	<i>Thanks for your feedback about climate change misinformation.</i>
An issue of concern is urban sprawl onto agricultural land. While having financial implications agricultural land must be protected.	<i>Thanks for sharing your concern over urban sprawl and the financial impact it has on agricultural land.</i>
Strict noise regulation for wedding venues.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on having strict noise regulation for wedding venues.</i>
Subdivision – agreed is needed and essential. Especially notifications	<i>Thank you for your feedback on the need for subdivisions and notifications.</i>
Infill is inappropriate; not structurally sound and need to preserve wetlands.	<i>Thanks for your input on the need to preserve wetlands and not allow infill.</i>
Septic for subdivision must be environmentally sound.	<i>Thank you for your input on the need to have a subdivision septic system that is environmentally sound.</i>
May also need rules for developers on soil removal and where they CAN NOT redeploy. i.e. not in flood plains or wetlands or low-lying areas.	<i>Thanks for your input on the need for rules on the redeployment of soil and not allowing it to happen on flood plains, low-lying areas and wetlands.</i>
Can the County put caveats on flood plain land? ANY development in the flood plain is inappropriate and must be removed.	<i>Thank you for your input that any development on a flood plain is inappropriate and must be removed.</i>

Trans Canada Trail is a very appropriate recreation opportunity for Leduc County.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on the appropriateness of the Trans Canada Trail as a recreation opportunity in Leduc County.</i>
Yes! Wildlife habitats, corridors and natural areas should be protected.	<i>Thanks for your input on protecting Wildlife habitats, corridors and natural areas.</i>
Improper land use needs to be enforced!	<i>Thank you for your input in the need to enforce improper land use.</i>
More wildlife protection, less extraction around riparian areas.	<i>Thanks for your feedback having more wildlife protection and less extraction around riparian areas.</i>
You need regulations regarding renewable energy projects to protect neighbors.	<i>Thank you for your input on the need for regulations on renewable energy projects to protect neighbors.</i>

Station: Lakeside living	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Leaves are the problem, cut poplar, plant spruce	<i>Thanks for the feedback about the issues regarding leaves.</i>
Air BnB and VRBO should not be allowed as the renters do not all respect the other residents and other properties.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on restricting Airbnb and VRBO.</i>
Air BnB if allowed need to be fully regulated i.e. maximum number of cars, people, etc.	<i>Thanks for you input about the need to fully regulate Airbnb.</i>
Mission Beach Pigeon Lake properties with original cabins being bought, torn down and extremely large houses being built. Startin to look like a city with nature being destroyed.	<i>Thanks for sharing your concerns about large houses being built and the impact on the natural environment.</i>
Drainage on private lots should be regulated.	<i>Thank you for your input on the regulating drainage of private lots.</i>
Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our concerns regarding bylaw restrictions to lots around Pigeon Lake which is located in Leduc County. The 2008 bylaws do not align with recreation zoned areas in Wetaskiwin County and Summer Villages around the lake. Serious consideration to going up with buildings rather than forcing landowners to build out should	<i>Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding bylaw restrictions on lots around Pigeon Lake.</i>

happen in the new set of bylaws. (Save Our Lake!)	
Short-term rentals should only be allowed if rented at least 30+ days.	<i>Thanks for your input on short-term rental and the minimum time they should be allowed to be rented.</i>
Lake watershed areas should follow the Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan recommendations.	<i>Thanks for your feedback about following the Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan recommendations.</i>
In Resort Residential District, a house can be 25 per cent of the site. There are some huge RR lots; investigate this and what it could mean. Need to cap house size in this district.	<i>Thank you for your feedback about capping house sizes in this district.</i>
Are current site coverage allowances appropriate? No, they allow too much sprawl on lakeside lots. Better to build up (allow second story—perhaps a suite above a garage) rather than have a cabin, a guest cabin and a garage on a lot.	<i>Thank you for your input about site coverage and the need to build up.</i>
Recreational property bylaw does not work well for lakefront properties. Restricting secondary building to 16ft with only 10% usable second floor causes residents to cover more of their property and reducing permeable land. Other beaches around the lake encourage 2 story building to reduce lot coverage in Gilwood Beach area there are numerous 2 story ancillary building, but new buildings of this style are not allowed right now. This bylaw is due for revision.	<i>Thank you for your input about the restrictions of building heights.</i>

Station: New Sarepta	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Not sure why you would spend money to redo the Yardley Jones Park when other parks (large ditch) should be covered. Leave the Yardley Jones building alone – it is part of history, and it is supposed to be a historical park.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on the Yardley Jones Park and building</i>
Do not remove the Tire & Girdle ____ bldg..	<i>Thanks for the feedback about not removing the Tire & Girdle building.</i>

Stand alone library for the public is a priority.	<i>Thanks for your input on having a stand-alone library.</i>
East Vistas should be developed in a contiguous manner.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on the East Vista development.</i>
Commercial land use areas should only be developed when population and need suggests or requires it.	<i>Thank you for your input on how commercial lands should be developed.</i>
Walking trails.	<i>Thanks for the input on having walking trails.</i>
Allot land for stand-alone library.	<i>Thanks for your input on having a stand-alone library.</i>
Community signage	<i>Thank you for the feedback that community signage is needed.</i>
Stand-alone library.	<i>Thanks for your input on having a stand-alone library.</i>
More public garbage cans.	<i>Thank you for your comment about having more public garbage cans.</i>
Need more street lights.	<i>Thank you for the feedback that more streetlights are needed.</i>
Fix the ball diamonds	<i>Thank you for the feedback to fix the ball diamonds.</i>
Get us some gates and proper sidewalk – pedestrian crossing!	<i>Thank you for the feedback that gates, proper sidewalks and pedestrian crossings are needed.</i>
Transition land use from [Nisku Business Park] into [Blackmud Creek], [North Vistas], [South Vistas] and [East Vistas]	<i>Thanks for the feedback on the transition of land in these areas.</i>
Fix the street lighting along Centre St.	<i>Thank you for the feedback that the streetlights on Centre Street need to be fixed.</i>
Increase park space including space for an outdoor rink and walking trails	<i>Thanks for the feedback that there needs to be an increase in park space including an outdoor rink and walking trails.</i>
Use a culvert in the extremely large unnecessary ditch that is between the two playgrounds to cover it up	<i>Thank you for the feedback on the culvert between the two playgrounds.</i>

Station: Rural living	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
No Comments received at this station.	

Station: Final thoughts	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Very impressed and appreciative of the staff who work on and developed this presentation. Thank you for your care and consideration!	<i>Thanks for the feedback on the open houses and staff.</i>
Very important! Conserve natural areas and wildlife habitat.	<i>Thanks for the input on the need to conserve natural areas and wildlife habitat.</i>
Important to our neighbors and myself to have freedom to have some farm animals for our own personal equipment/use; to also have the same flexibility on outbuildings for Personal use; i.e. Workshop; greenhouse; boat/RV/tractor ATV storage.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on having the freedom to have farm animals and various types of outbuildings.</i>
Open up more spaces for fishing, paddling and nature hiking trails (such as the Clifford E. Lee Nature Sanctuary in Parkland).	<i>Thanks for the input to create more outdoor spaces and recreation activities.</i>
Allow small scale agriculture and livestock on rural properties.	<i>Thank you for your input to allow small scale agriculture and livestock on rural properties.</i>
Leduc County is years ahead of (other local municipalities) for planning matters and support.	<i>Thank you for your comment.</i>
Ensure that we're not forcing unnecessary application requirements on developers, such as requesting a biophysical when common sense suggests it is not needed.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on application requirements for developers.</i>
IDP with Sundance, Itaska and Leduc [County] is an excellent document outlining the vision for the area.	<i>Thank you for your comment.</i>

There needs to be some incentive for people to keep their properties clean. When a person upgrades their property, their taxes usually go up. People need to be penalized for unsightly and run-down yards.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on how to address unsightly properties through incentives and penalties.</i>
Yes to personal management (freedom) of farm animals and outbuildings on rural, privately-owned property.	<i>Thanks for the input on allowing freedom and personal management of farm animals and outbuildings on rural privately-owned property.</i>
A disincentive should be built in to unsightly properties.	<i>Thanks for the input on creating a disincentive to unsightly property.</i>
In each of the lake district areas, including Resort Residential District, Country Residential District, Acreage Residential District, REQUIRE (not encourage) a cap on tree clearing.	<i>Thank you for your input on requiring a cap on tree clearing.</i>
Stronger language is required, needed to protect healthy vegetation.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on the need to include stronger language to protect healthy vegetation.</i>
Refer to PLWA LUB implementation guidelines; same considerations should apply to development coverage area (limits).	<i>Thanks for the feedback to reference the Pigeon Lake Watershed Association LUB guidelines for development coverage.</i>
[Submission: Battle River Watershed Alliance management plan – recommendations for municipal response – plans, policies and programs]	<i>Thank you for your submission, the county will consider it when developing the Land Use Bylaw.</i>
[Submission: Shoreline and Riparian Condition Assessment – Leduc County]	<i>Thank you for your submission, the county will consider it when developing the Land Use Bylaw.</i>
Refer to the <i>Battle River Watershed Alliance Riparian Management Implementation Guidelines: A watershed management planning document.</i>	<i>Thank you for your submission, the county will consider it when developing the Land Use Bylaw.</i>
LUB is required to manage setbacks from creeks.	<i>Thanks for your input to manage setback from creeks.</i>
Add Lake Watershed District designation for Coal Lake and ESA designation.	<i>Thank you for your input to add Lake Watershed District and Environmental Significant Area designation for Coal Lake.</i>
Acknowledgement of the Battle River Watershed Alliance: state of the watershed, watershed management plans, shoreline and riparian conditions assessment.	<i>Thanks for your input.</i>
We need some method of enforcing improper land use!! Why not fines? Inspection needs to be done in order to enforce.	<i>Thank you for your input about the need to enforce proper and improper land use through inspections and fines.</i>
a. Natural areas of marginal land should be left for wild animals and birds. Coulee areas should NOT be developed!	<i>Thanks for the input on natural areas.</i>

Well said [REDACTED]	<i>Thanks for the input.</i>
Stop development in the coulee areas and land adjacent.	<i>Thanks for the input on not allowing development in coulee areas and adjacent lands.</i>

Online comments

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received input from 12 respondents through the project page.

Verbatim comments and responses

Question: What do you think of the overall vision we've shared for the bylaw so far?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
I think clarity is a big issue with the current bylaw in place. Everything is vague and rules for a property that is 1 acre should not apply to a lot that is 8 acres. Blanket rules Don't usually work when you have properties of different types all under the same rules and regulations. There is a huge difference in land size and on a larger property the requirements for having a trailer to haul water, garden soil, snow removal equipment, lawn equipment and many other uses is a necessity. Having blanket rules for all properties in my opinion doesn't work. Larger properties should have more freedom and smaller properties can have more restrictions that are reasonable.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on the need to have more specific rules for all types of properties.</i>
Larger properties should have the ability to have some small farm animals such as a horse or chickens etc. A maximum amount makes sense of course, like 25 chickens for example. There should be more acceptance for living off your land in preparation for the next pandemic.	<i>Thank you for your input that larger properties should have the ability to have some small farm animals.</i>
Couldn't immediately find the overall piece. Reviewed the purpose statement in Section 1.1. Recommend referencing the municipal purpose to foster the well being of the environment (as per MGA s. 3 (a.1) of which the LUB is one implementation tool.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on referencing the municipal purpose to foster the well-being of the environment.</i>

<p>We feel more emphasis is being placed on what's being put forward by developers and not the average long time owner of properties in the County - in our case older established acreages. We are being left out and County services that used to be in place are not here anymore or are not improving.</p>	<p><i>Thanks for your feedback on the emphasis placed on developers and long-time property owners.</i></p>
<p>The current bylaw states that they are not allowed to have their truck parked on their property, to me that is really silly since if you take a drive around Leduc, you will see a number of different residents who park their welding trucks on their driveways or on the city street in front of their home. To say that someone cannot do this when they have an acreage or a farm, that is not reasonable. Residence on acreages and farms should be allowed to have their work vehicle parked at their house. I of course understand that if somebody is operating a crane truck or some kind of large piece of equipment, maybe that would be something they should have to get a permit for or special permission maybe, but that would be considered an extreme case in my opinion. Another example of a vehicle that could see restrictions would be if it was very loud, that would make sense to have restrictions on vehicles that are very loud because when somebody rolls in at 11:00 p.m. at night nobody wants to have to listen to that. In my subdivision, we have people who rip through here with their expensive cars with loud exhaust and they often do it at night time, but none of us residents believe that these people are actually living out here but our visitors from the city coming to race around rural community asphalt roads. These are just a few of the things that I can think of that will need attention. In a nutshell I think that in the hindsight of the previous pandemic, residents really need the options to be able to stay home if needed and still be able to run their small businesses and live off of their land. I believe this is a major concern for many citizens as I have talked to many people over the last 2 years and quite a few people seem to feel the same.</p>	<p><i>Thanks for your input on regulations that do not allow trucks of a certain size to be parked on property.</i></p>

So far, so good. a few more points to be narrowed down on home based-business/land-use specifically pertaining to short-term rentals and equivalent houses/lands.	<i>Thanks for input on home based-business / land-use specifically pertaining to short-term rentals and equivalent houses / lands.</i>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Question: Do you have any comments on the information in the administrative and process section?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Seems acceptable	<i>Thanks for the feedback.</i>
We would like to see clear understanding and definitions for many parts of the bylaw especially those pertaining to secondary residence and garden suits as the current bylaw is vague and unclear as to the true requirements that need to be met and the items that are clear seem unreasonable or to contradict such as asking for a separate full structure for a garden suit but then only given a 5 year permit. We are looking to have my daughter and son in law purchase our property then place a smaller (ideally around 100 sq-ft) on the property to live in tied into the existing utilities (so a garden suit) the current bylaws have frustrating limitation and unclear requirements as mentioned above. Any update to this section giving more clarity would be welcome.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on wanting more specifics for secondary residence and garden suites</i>
Consider clarifying the definition of water body to explicitly include wetlands (currently only the classes swamp and marsh are mentioned). o E.g. Strathcona County: WATER BODY means any location where water flows or is present, whether or not the flow or the presence of water is continuous, intermittent or occurs only during a flood, and includes but is not limited to wetlands and aquifers as defined by the Water Act. Or include a separate definition of wetlands such as (set out in the Alberta Wetland Policy): Wetlands are land saturated with water long enough to promote formation of water altered soils, growth of water tolerant	<i>Thanks for the feedback on clarifying the definition of water body to explicitly include wetlands.</i>

vegetation, and various kinds of biological activity that are adapted to the wet environment.	
We truly believe the people in administration could care less about our opinions - they already seem to have a set agenda.	<i>Thank you for sharing your thoughts. The County is taking into consideration all the input and opinions when developing the Land Use Bylaw.</i>

Question: Do you have any comments on the information in the Nisku Business Park and business section?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Seems acceptable	<i>Thank you for your feedback.</i>
Require Experience of Lacombe County is that for business parks despite pressure for constructing square stormwater ponds leaving natural wetlands intact can be more cost effective as they require less maintenance. In addition, the experience that the lots backing on to wetlands were higher value (as in residential districts) as businesses wanted a place for employees to go for a walk at lunch or for administrative staff to have a view. Review setback requirements to ensure alignment with current evidence-based guidelines on setbacks from wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas and establish minimum setback distances from wetlands. o Prohibit disturbance or impact of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas.	<i>Thank you for the input regarding wetlands, setbacks and stormwater ponds.</i>
The only thing we feel should have been addressed is the fact that more responsibility should be accepted by the County to ensure there is a decent buffer between the Blackmud Creek and development. No one seems to care about a proper buffer - developers are increasing their building pockets by destroying the existing banks. Is the creek eventually going to be filled in completely? Such a shame!	<i>Thank you for your feedback on the county having a buffer between development and the Blackmud Creek.</i>

Question: Do you have any comments on the information in the **urban living and the Vistas** section?

Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Review setback requirements to ensure alignment with current evidence-based guidelines on setbacks from wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas and establish minimum setback distances from wetlands. o Prohibit disturbance or impact of wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on setback requirements using evidence-based guidelines for wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas.</i>
This area impacts us the most. Most of us moved here because we wanted acreage living - space, tranquility, wildlife, no street lights or houses with 20+ outside lights blaring over properties, and reduced traffic. All this with the fact that we were also close to amenities - schools, major roads, and city water. To allow developments that seem to have no regard to this lifestyle is creating animosity amongst neighbors, all because of decisions made by people in Planning and Development. Most of them don't live here, have no vested interest in this area and are not following some of their own land use bylaws. As far as we know, this has always been classified as single family residential (as far as we know, that may have been changed by now as well). Development in our area, Irvine Creek - which no one even heard of until it was happening - and now the explosion of activity in the East Vistas area, is nothing more than appeasing developers at the expense of our tranquility, compromising our already over-crowded schools and huge increase in traffic volumes. There is no doubt gaining access to Range Road 245, Township Road 510, and even getting unto the 625 is going to become an issue. Urbanization is inevitable at a certain point in time but shouldn't be at the expense of existing residents.	<i>Thank you for your input about increased development.</i>

Question: Do you have any comments on the information in the **agriculture** section?

Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Seems acceptable	<i>Thank you for your feedback.</i>
I think that considering my comments in the previous section, acreages should be allowed to have some more options when it comes to agriculture. But I think that there should be limitations based on the size of property. I used an example of a 1 acre property versus an 8 acre property, these are completely different properties whereas one could probably have a horse versus the other one if they had a horse it would probably end up standing in their driveway all the time and that makes sense to have a restriction on whether they have a horse or not.	<i>Thank you for your input on what limitations should be put on different types and sizes of land.</i>
I also think there should be better access for acreage and farm owners to be incentivized to deal with their hazardous waste. All of these rural properties are on well water and if there are incentives for people to dispose of their hazardous waste properly, that will help protect our water for future generations.	<i>Thank you for your input on how to incentivize disposal of hazard waste to protect the water supply.</i>
I refer back to land use for short-term rentals. This land type should be for growing food only.	<i>Thanks for your feedback that the land should only be used to grow food.</i>
Given limited understanding of the historical context, jurisdiction & municipal authority I'd like to understand if it would make sense to require a permit for "Clearing, stripping, grading or excavation of land for agricultural purposes".	<i>Thanks for your feedback questioning if it makes sense to have a permit for "Clearing, stripping, grading or excavation of land for agricultural purposes".</i>
I am in agreement with removing the requirement that certain secondary dwellings must be subject to time-limited approvals.	<i>Thanks for your input on removing the requirement that certain secondary dwellings must be subject to time-limited approvals.</i>
On an active farm, we are often in a position where we need extra help and a permanent extra dwelling or a mobile home or park model would help to facilitate that need.	<i>Thank you for your input on the need for extra dwellings on a farm.</i>

We have to say, it was sad to see some of the rich farmland along the Spine Road disappear.	<i>Thank you for sharing your feedback on the loss of farmland.</i>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Question: Do you have any comments on the information in the other topics section?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
I think there should be a discussion on blanket rules for all properties, versus rules that allow people with larger properties to have less restrictions based on the size of land they have. In my opinion size of land that starts seeing more freedom could be around 1 acre and then increase as the size of land continues.	<i>Thanks for your feedback on how rules should apply and not apply based upon the size of the property.</i>
At our age - we've lived here since 1973 and owned this property since 1970 - we don't feel we are asking for much when we hope people will consider our wishes for the area. We were asked to get a petition together about developments in our particular subdivision. We were told that the wishes of the majority should be honoured by the County's a Planning and Development Department. To date, November 12, 2023, we have yet to hear from anyone. Sad!	<i>Thank you for your feedback, we are considering all feedback received through public participation in the review and revision of the Land Use Bylaw.</i>

Question: Do you have any additional comments or feedback you would like to share with the County?	
Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Thank you for all of your hard work, I really appreciate that this by law is being updated because there are so many things that have changed in our society since 2008.	<i>Thanks for your feedback.</i>
I would like to see very pointed discussions over an outright ban on short-term rentals on acreages and farms. This is only a place for parties and other less legal activities that locals	<i>Thank you for your feedback to ban short-term rentals on acreages and farms.</i>

continuously face. Ask anyone who has been trying to live near one. We had to spend a year next door to one.	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Phone submissions

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received no input from respondents through phone calls.

Social media comments

Between June 5 and Nov. 30, we received input from a total of two unique respondents through our social media posts and advertisements. Due to the nature of social media profiles, we cannot confirm the legitimacy of respondents.

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

Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Should update the land use for unsightly businesses. Just a couple of blocks north of the Leduc County building is a salvage/wrecking yard that is a marvel to see. I'm surprised some of the parts haven't migrated into the ditch.	<i>Thanks for the feedback on unsightly businesses.</i>
Land use bylaw.. pound sand. My land I'll do as I please. More illegal laws and permits and levies and taxes... ENOUGH!	<i>Thanks for your input.</i>

Other questions

The questions asked below have been documented for transparency; however, only input is used to influence the decision-making for this project.

Question (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response from administration
Part 2: Planning Authorities 3 Development Authority 4 Development Officer 4.1 A Development Officer is any person designated through the Chief Administrative Officer ... The previous Bylaw states: shall be filled by a person or persons	<i>This has been amended to align with the true process where the CAO has the authority through a bylaw adopted by Council to designate any person as a Development Officer.</i>

appointed by Council. What is the reason for this change?	
<p>3.2 Each application shall include the abovementioned information, unless any omissions have been explicitly agreed in writing between the Development Authority and applicant. (Is there a need for this exception if all application are intended to be treated the same?</p>	<p><i>This allows flexibility to be applied to situations where material considerations exist.</i></p>
<p>5.8.3 In any circumstance where . . . will there be any consideration of a penalty for development that has commenced prior to approval of a permit?</p> <p>5.9 Completion of Development - what is the intent behind this section?</p>	
Does the statement “has the lowest taxes in the region” refer to business tax or all taxes in general?	<p><i>The statement that this quote has come from was made in reference to Nisku Business. Contact Assessment Services for further discussion and questions regarding County property taxes.</i></p>
It appears Direct Control has become the norm and not the exception within the Nisku Business Park. Without the benefit of knowing what districts would be included makes it difficult to comment on this section. How is it proposed to address specific regulations unavailable in other land use districts if this is changed?	<p><i>We are currently proposing a significant reduction on Direct Control districts, specifically in our business parks.</i></p>
There is no area to comment on the South of Devon Area Structure Plan or where this is to be included in the Land Use Bylaw. Will it be identified in a similar fashion as the Nisku Business Park?	<p><i>A South of Devon station was provided at the open houses. There are no significant changes outside of the newly created districts that will be applied to the business park in general.</i></p>

It is nice to see more typically residential development and a mix of land uses planned for the County although have some concerns about the cost of urban standards for this area. Will this be covered by developers, a local improvement bylaw or covered by all the ratepayers in the County?	<i>These matters are typically addressed through development agreements with the developer. Please contact the Manager of Development Services for a more in-depth discussion regarding this matter.</i>
It is envisioned that there be easy walking distance to parks, schools, shops and amenities which suggests that this area may become more of an “urban town centre” and less of a country residential development. Is this the intent?	<i>This is the intent for the East Vistas Urban Growth Area and not for classic country residential areas.</i>
With development of this area to much higher urban standards, would there be a requirement to increase side yard setbacks to allow for snow removal?	<i>These matters are typically addressed within detailed site designs and architectural controls and may be addressed within a development agreement.</i>
Secondary dwelling garden suite clarification for subdivision in eight-acre property. How large a dwelling can we build? 1000 sq. ft.?	<i>Sizes will be specified within the land use bylaw.</i>
Is there a timeline for providing proposed changes to the rest of the LUB?	<i>Please refer to the project webpage at yoursayledduccounty.com for progress and updates.</i>

Other comments

<i>Comment (verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	<i>Response from administration</i>
There should be a solar grant available for acreages and farms because their power usage is quite a bit more than residential houses in urban areas. This Grant should be at least \$10,000 because the systems these acreages and farms will need would be quite a bit bigger than that in an urban area. I think there needs to be something like this in place because there is a lot more of a draw on rural areas for the power grid and having the acreages and farms incentivized to install solar panels would help with this problem in a big way.	<i>Thanks for your feedback about having a grant for solar power.</i>
Need a bylaw about white noise backup beepers.	<i>Thanks for your input about white noise backup beepers.</i>

Based on some of the comments received, it is clear land-use governance is a controversial topic that can evoke various emotions. Social trends and world affairs have contributed to misinformation and disinformation about Leduc County's Land Use Bylaw, and about municipal government processes and responsibilities in general.

The input below has been documented for transparency; however, as it is unrelated to Leduc County's Land Use Bylaw, it will not be used to influence the decision-making for this project.

Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>
Everyone should go
Not one single council in Canada not corrupted by the UN agenda. You might be small but you sold out like all the others.
More rules from the government directed by WEF.
Leduc County a Mandate is not a law, and it's legally not enforceable as there is no provision in the criminal code of Canada to uphold any penalty your county decides to create a bylaw for. Again. I'll decide what to do with MY LAND! Not you or the province or the Federal government. We all have sovereign rights provided by the Canadian constitution and basic human rights....
They will mess this completely, fight it! you will own nothing and be happy as you move to a 15 min city
Allow individuals to make their own decisions, the county will shape up just fine. Allowing politicians to get their hands on that shape, it will not be a pretty picture.
Leduc County there is no community input this is a ruse. The UN and their agents will dictate how the land is used according to sustainable development goals. Stop lying to people. You will be the low hanging fruit when the community is betrayed. Stop kidding yourselves. Now is the time for you to do the right thing and reject outside influence. Good luck with that
██████████ look at Sadiq Khan and his ULEZ zones, unilaterally dictating to the public UN mandates. The public now pays fines for breaking these mandates can have their vehicles taken away. There is going to be a clash between these criminal globalists and their goals and the public, the county needs to side with the public or they will be seen as agents for these globalists.
Leduc County this is nothing more than you being paid to enshrine UN globalist policies for "sustainability directives" that you have absolutely no legal right to do. We WILL NOT COMPLY with tyranny. You will not be dictating to me what I am allowed to do on my land. The UN has NO LEGAL AUTHORITY to do what they are trying to do. Not do you, or the Province. You're about to find out what "We the people" will do to protect our life and liberty.
Leduc County when you lose your own home or a carage you will see what you've allowed to happen.

	<p>YouTube Rosa Koire Agenda 21. Rural interview Randy Hillier. The cities are already bought and sold and beholdened to the to the UN System ICLEI. The globalists are targeting the rural communities that are considered unsustainable. It is worst than most people think.</p>
	<p>Words Canadians will grow to despise.</p> <p>Sustainable Equity Inclusive</p> <p>These are all Trojan horses for destroying Canadian prosperity. Not one village in the world is safe from the tentacles of the UN. Their goal to inventory every single resource including human on the planet and be the unelected stewards of these resources. Your property is up for grabs.</p>
	<p>Is this consultation? The UN definition with regard to land use. If the community doesn't protest or litigate against the county. Next year all the ideas that the community disagreed with will now be put into law.</p>
	<p>Becoming controlled by the Liberal/NDP dictatorship. It's time for Smith to tell The Crime Sinister of Ottawa to stay the hell out of Provincial Territory!!! SCHWABS PUPPETS!!!</p>
	<p>they are very clever these globalists we need all hands on deck.</p>
	<p>How about let the people who own the property decide what they do with it and the politicians can keep their over reach out of the taxpayers homes.</p>
	<p>Fact is all in the Leduc area better attend, put the fear of God into all politicians, you were all to scared to stand up during the covid lie, better grow a pair of balls now</p>
	<p>How about let the people who own the property decide what they do with it and the politicians can keep their over reach out of the taxpayers homes.</p>
	<p>How do we the people in the Leduc County organize to educate the fools who are supposedly looking at the Land Use Bylaws implementation for Leduc County. I'm new to Leduc and would like to know if the community is organized to address this power grab?</p>
	<p>We already pay way to much for taxes in Leduc County and for what.... A grader to go by once a month and push all the gravel into the ditches, then the county charges us to re-gravel the roads.</p> <p>How about lower the taxes for the country folks who don't use city water, sewer, landfill, garbage pickup etc.</p>
	<p>get the word out as much as you can. There are FB groups just for Land Use bylaws around AB. Some are awake, I am loving the comments on this post. But sadly, most will just follow 🐑</p>
	<p>and yet you wore the mask in the last 3 years, summited your freedoms away😞</p>
	<p>yes, there were a few times that I was unable to avoid wearing a mask. Just as I obey the idiotic speed limits in Beaumont, playground zone limits in school zones where there are no playgrounds near the road. That said, perhaps you could try making a point, instead of being a pratt.</p>
	<p>my point is, you do the coffee shop grip of the situation, but are you going to the meeting</p>
	<p>we have FULL intentions. Will you stand against the UN sustainability directives for Canada?</p>
	<p>Leduc County</p> <p>Some people there in that office decided shaping are gravel roads with a four pass system was a good idea also and I have never seen the back road in such poor shape 🤔</p>

Are these consultants contracted by the counties to help implement the land use bylaws from a company in India with an office in Edmonton? Thorhild County residents voted these proposals out with just cause!!! Alberta County Residents Beware!!!!
<p>do you drive on YOUR ROADS? Send your kids to YOUR SCHOOLS? How about go to YOUR PARKS? You may own your land, but you use infrastructure that is part of a community. You have a chance to let your county know what that community looks like. Want less regulation? Let them know, but with that may come other problems, or maybe it will be better.</p> <p>I guarantee many of your neighbors are going to give their input. Do they want their neighbor to be able to have 20 dogs and a junkyard next to them? Do they want a construction business located on a piece of land in a subdivision?</p>
<p>that's not even close to what's going on.</p> <p>Do you own a farm? Say 100 acres? Would you like to farm a portion of that land to support and sustain the cows and chickens you have?</p> <p>This plan is all about ALLOWING you to farm.... or not. You may not be allowed to have cattle as their methane emissions are considered a "green house gas" and therefore harmful to the environment. No cows for you!</p> <p>How about dirt farming... nope! Not allowed! Tractors cause "global warming" due to tailpipe emissions. No tractors for you!</p> <p>This thinly veiled attempt at TOTAL CONTROL of YOU is exactly what they're after.</p> <p>You have almost unlimited information and knowledge at your fingertips. Please stop listening to the MSM. Attitudes like yours will doom us all to a life of servitude and oppression.</p> <p>Agenda 2030....</p>
<p>right, so here's your chance to say what you want and to even influence your fellow citizens to support your view. Many county politicians are actually wanting to know how to help and support local farmers. Educate them.</p>
Tofield LUB concerns – wanted RAMP info.
Leduc County culverts currently not maintained.
Please investigate accepting liability for the train to not blow horn from whistle stop through town.
No more trains blowing their horns excessively.
<p>A stop sign needs to be added to the street behind Flying J which is the back alley to Centre Street. Too many people speed through there and have narrowly missed residents trying to go home.</p>
The building may be used to store garden tools as well.
The 1 ton vehicle rule should be changed because everyone has an F350 these days.