

**CONTINUATION OF ADJOURNED HEARING (June 18, 2020)**

**AGENDA**

**INTERMUNICIPAL SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD (ISDAB)**

**QUALITY INN & SUITES - EDMONTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT  
(501 - 11 AVENUE, NISKU, ALBERTA)**

**Thursday, July 9, 2020**

**1. Adoption of Previous Minutes**

June 18, 2020 Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Meeting

**2. Reconvene Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Hearing**

- \* a) 9:00 a.m. D20-041 Appeal by Kevin & Karen Neilson & 82 other Leduc  
Roll # 264000 County residents relating to Development Permit  
Application D20-041 by Anuj Gutpa for a rural wedding  
and agricultural event facility with frame and fabric  
structure - 390 sq.m and two trailers 90 sq.m each located  
at NE 19-50-22-W4 (50352 Range Road 225)

**3. Next Meeting Date – at the call of the Chair**

**4. Adjournment**

  
Legend

\* Items Attached To Agenda



**MINUTES OF THE INTERMUNICIPAL SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD MEETING, LEDUC COUNTY, HELD ON THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2020 AT THE QUALITY INN AND SUITES, NISKU, ALBERTA.**

---

**Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m., Thursday, July 9, 2020 by Chair Mary-Ann McDonald and Board Members Kevin Maine, Pat Rudiger, Rod Giles and Doug Ruel present.

Present as well were the following:

- Joyce Gavan, Clerk
- Lynn White, Recording Secretary
- Colin Richards Team Lead Development
- Charlene Haverland, Manager of Development Services
- Greg McGovern, Planner 1
- Rae-Lynne Spila, Senior Municipal Engineer

Others in attendance:

- Kevin and Karen Neilson, Appellants
- Anuj Gupta, Applicant
- Krishna Gupta, Resident
- and 10 other residents/interested parties

**Agenda Adoption**

**21-20** Board Member Rudiger -- that the agenda for the July 9, 2020 Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be accepted as circulated.

Carried

**Adoption of Previous Minutes – June 18, 2020**

**22-20** Board Member Giles -- that the June 18, 2020 Subdivision and Development Appeal Board minutes be confirmed as circulated.

Carried

**Appeal by Kevin & Karen Neilson & ±82 other Leduc County residents relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-041 by Anuj Gupta for a rural wedding and agricultural event facility with frame and fabric structure and two trailers each located at NE 19-50-22-W4 (50352 Range Road 225)**

---

Chair McDonald called the hearing to order at 9:02 a.m. and provided introductory remarks.

Chair McDonald called upon the board clerk to introduce the appeal.

Joyce Gavan, Clerk, advised of the appeal by Kevin and Karen Neilson and ±82 other Leduc County residents relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-041 by Anuj Gupta for a rural wedding and agricultural event facility with frame and fabric structure and two trailers each located at NE 19-50-22-W4 (50352 Range Road 225).

The reasons for appeal have been submitted and forms part of the agenda package and are highlighted as follows:

1. Lack of respect for neighbors, community and process
2. Noise and disruption of our cattle, horses and other domestic animals, wildlife and people of this active farming community
3. Traffic
4. Security/Safety
5. Alcohol and drug related behavior
6. Inability to enforce permit conditions
7. Potential violation of fire and safety regulations
8. Increased litter concerns
9. Impact on adjacent land
10. Impact on community/county facilities - reduced potential for use
11. Reduction in farm property values
12. Light pollution
13. Process problems
14. Previous experience
15. Not the right fit
16. Leduc County Bylaw 7-08 requirement for approval for this development permit

The following information is provided for the Board:

1. June 19, 2020 notice of continuation of hearing (as adjourned on June 18, 2020)
2. Registered Speakers Listing
3. Notice of Appeal package dated June 2, 2020
4. Notice of Appeal dated June 2, 2020 received by Kevin & Karen Neilson & ±82 other Leduc County residents
5. Administrative staff report (including Power-Point Presentation)
6. Appellants submissions by Kevin & Karen Neilson
7. Submissions received in support of the appeal (against the proposed development)
8. Applicant's submissions by Anuj Gupta

The Board confirmed the appeal was submitted properly and acceptable to the Board.

Chair McDonald asked if any Board member felt a need to step down from this hearing within the boundaries of conflict of interest, and there was no one.

Chair McDonald asked the appellants if they had any objection to any of the members of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing this appeal, and there was no objection indicated.

Chair McDonald then explained the purpose of hearing, the order of presentations and the procedures to follow.

Chair McDonald called upon the Development Authority to provide background information.

Colin Richards, Team Lead Development, provided a PowerPoint presentation and staff report relating to the appeal, highlighting the following:

1. The subject property is located southwest of the intersection of Township Road 504 and Range Road 225, approximately 4 km southeast of the Hamlet of Looma and 6.5 km northwest of New Sarepta.

2. The parcel is 32 ha (79.5 ac) in size and is located within the Agricultural / Country Residential Transitional District of the Land Use Bylaw. In accordance with the district regulations of the Land Use Bylaw, the purpose of this district is *"to provide primarily for agricultural operations, while at the same time providing for limited residential and other uses having a secondary role to agriculture."*
3. This property is largely pasture land apart from a 5.5 ha (13.5 ac) forested area that lies within the eastern portion of the property.
4. Development on the property consists of a house and double garage which is located on the eastern side of the property that is accessed directly from Range Road 225.
5. Lands surrounding the subject property also fall within the Agricultural / Country Residential Transitional District and are predominantly utilized for agricultural and residential uses.
6. The nearest dwelling to the proposed wedding venue is located approximately 200 metres to the east, followed by a dwelling located approximately 500 metres to the northwest. There are a total of 7 dwellings located within a 1 km radius of the development area and 26 dwellings located within a 1.5 km radius.
7. The subject application proposed a rural wedding and event facility, which would be suitable for events like weddings, birthdays and corporate events.
8. Development required to support the application is proposed within and adjacent to the forested area of the property which is located along the eastern portion of the site. The proposed development includes the clearing of 2 areas of trees within this area. The first area will be within a 836 m<sup>2</sup> (9,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) area of tree clearing to accommodate two 90 m<sup>2</sup> (969 ft<sup>2</sup>) site trailers for use as a bridal dressing suite and a 465 m<sup>2</sup> (5,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) concrete pad where a 390 m<sup>2</sup> (4,198 ft<sup>2</sup>) tent for wedding receptions will be erected.
9. The second area includes a 279 m<sup>2</sup> (3,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) area of tree clearing for a wedding ceremony space, and this area has been selected by the applicant for its natural setting.
10. The applicants indicate the venue would accommodate gatherings of between 30 and 230 guests and expects vehicle traffic associated with any event to be between 10 and 80 vehicles. Parking for the facility is proposed within a 0.46 ha (1.14 ac) gravel parking lot situated along the northwestern perimeter of the forested area of the site.
11. The anticipated events on the subject property are 30 to 50 per year and the business anticipates being operational from May 1<sup>st</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup> per calendar year. The initial application proposed operational to be 9am and midnight, 7 days per week, however, the County's development authority decision restricted the hours.
12. This application was approved under the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility land use which is a discretionary use within the agricultural / country residential transitional district. The use was added to the district in March 2020, by County Council, through a formal public hearing process.
13. Before a decision was made, the application was referred to the County's internal departments for comments and was also referred directly to adjacent landowners by way of personal letter.
14. In response to the referral, there were no concerns raised by the County's internal departments which includes Safety Codes, Engineering & Utilities and Agricultural Services.



15. The County received 34 letters of objection from landowners. Of those 34 letters, 5 were located within 1 km of the subject property, 7 were located between 1 km and 1.5 km from the property, and 21 were located between 2 km and 6.5 km from the property.
16. The key concerns submitted related to: noise from vehicles, music, fireworks and large crowds; impact upon livestock; antisocial behavior, litter and garbage; property devaluation; increase of traffic on roads; dust and light pollution; the 7 day per week operation of the business; guest numbers associated with the business; fire risk, and that the use should be within a commercial area.
17. In order to be supportable by planning staff, the operational requirements of the business were restricted by conditions in order to reduce the overall impact and to address the concerns raised within objection letters submitted during the referral of the application.
18. Within the approval, some of the key restrictions included as conditions within the development approval included:
  - Issuing a temporary approval valid only until October 31, 2021 to allow the Development Authority to review the operational impact of the facility prior to considering additional approval.
  - The requirement for a Traffic Impact Assessment to be undertaken to determine any impact upon local roadways and to undertake any road upgrades if recommended.
  - Restricting operational parameters to Fridays and Saturdays from 9:00 am to midnight and Sundays from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm only.
  - Limiting the facility's annual operational season from May 1<sup>st</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup> during the life of the development permit.
  - Limiting passenger vehicles associated with the facility to a maximum of 80 on site at any given time.
  - Limiting guests associated with the facility to a maximum of 230 on site at any given time.
  - And prohibiting the use of fireworks in association with any event held on site.
19. Noise impact is notably the largest concern within the appeal submission, where concerns raised that the development will disrupt cattle, horses, domestic animals, wildlife and residents of the local farming community throughout the summer months. It was also stated that local animals have been detrimentally impacted by noise created from historical events at this property.
20. In response to noise concerns the County imposed restrictive conditions of approval. Condition 12 restricts maximum guest numbers to 230 on the property at any given time. To further reduce potential noise impacts, condition 9 was included to limit the operation of the facility to Fridays and Saturdays between the hours of 9:00 am and midnight and Sundays between 9:00 am and 3:00 pm only. The initial application requested operational hours of 9:00 am to midnight, 7 days per week, however, this was significantly scaled back in response to noise concerns.
21. Condition 8 restricts the operational season for the facility between the months of May and October during the life of the permit, which means for 6 months of the year, the facility cannot operate at all and therefore would not create any noise during the closed season.

22. The County received a number of concerns about the noise impact of fireworks and as a result condition 13 was included within the approval which strictly prohibits the use of fireworks for any event.
23. The appellants submit that the decision of the County fails to consider that the applicant had previously held 2 events on the premises prior to obtaining a development permit, and those events created major noise concerns. In order to investigate this, staff consulted the County's enforcement database which showed no record of any complaints being submitted in relation to any historical events that may have occurred on the subject premises.
24. Traffic impact has been submitted as a concern, with comments being raised that the venue will create a 'massive' increase in traffic, illegal parking on County roads and risk to livestock from vehicles utilizing the venue. In response to this, we can confirm that the County's engineers review of the application included an assessment of impact on roadways and they did not consider that the proposed development would have any detrimental impact on the local road network or would require any road upgrades within the area.
25. Despite this, staff included condition 6 within the permit that requires the landowner to contact the Engineering & Utilities department to determine whether the submittal of a Traffic Impact Assessment is required. It is anticipated that the development may require the applicant to provide dust suppression, and this requirement will be agreed upon between the applicant and the Engineering & Utilities department prior to the operation of the facility.
26. In response to potential parking on County roads, condition 17 addresses this and prohibits event traffic from parking within any County road right-of-way.
27. Drainage impacts beyond the boundary of the property have been raised as a concern. In response to this, we can confirm to the Board that the County's engineers have considered potential drainage impacts from the development and during their review, no drainage concerns were raised. Notwithstanding this, condition 16 was included in the decision that states the development shall not cause any adverse drainage impacts on adjacent properties or nearby ditches.
28. Going forward, should it be found that the development results in drainage impacts, the County enforcement action can be taken, however, as the development is located 250 metres from the property to the west, 320 metres from the property to the south, 55 metres from the County road to the east and 320 metres from the County road to the north, it is not anticipated that the development would create flooding or drainage issues outside of the property boundary.
29. Light pollution on the local farming community has been raised as a concern. In order to ensure minimal impacts from lighting, appropriate conditions were implemented. On top of restricting operational days Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays only through condition 9, where closure is required by midnight, Condition 10 restricts the venue's operation to the months of May through October where daylight lasts late into the evening, which would reduce light impact in itself.
30. In addition to this, given that the venue will be located within a dense forested area it is not envisaged that detrimental amounts of light pollution will be splayed into the surrounding farming community. In order to protect against this however, condition 4



ensures that should any excessive or offensive glare be imposed on adjacent properties, the County can take necessary enforcement actions to remedy it.

31. The appellants indicate that the structure proposed for this facility potentially violates fire and safety regulations due to the materials proposed for the structure and its setting within a forested area. The County can confirm that the application was referred to Leduc County Fire Services for comment, who did not submit concerns in response to the proposal. To ensure fire safety is met for this venue, condition 20 directs that firefighting access be available at all times to the venue, and advisory note 4 within the decision directs the applicant to contact Leduc County Fire Services directly to discuss how to ensure the facility complies with the Alberta Fire Code.
32. In addition to that, Condition 5 directs the applicant to obtain all required Safety Codes approvals prior to operating the approved venue. Leduc County Safety Codes staff have advised us that they are working with the applicant to ensure the proposed building(s) conforms to all required building codes.
33. The appellants state in their submission that the approval cannot be enforced by the County. In response to the above, we would just like to confirm that under the provisions of the Land Use Bylaw, a Development Authority can enforce any permit issued under the Land Use Bylaw.
34. Within the powers given to the planning department, if a development is found to contravene the conditions of a permit, the Development Authority can serve the landowner with an order to either stop the development or use, demolish or remove the development, or carry out a required action to ensure compliance with the conditions of a permit. Failure to comply with an order issued by the Development Authority gives the power to take whatever lawful action is necessary to ensure compliance.
35. To summarize, the Development Authority consider that the planning concerns raised in both the initial circulation of the application and the grounds of appeal have been addressed within the 21 conditions of approval.
36. Within those Conditions, the venue is restricted to an operational calendar of only 6 months of the year, and within those months, is only allowed to operate 3 days per week. Conditions restrict operating hours to reduce night time impacts in consideration of nearby properties, and a condition completely prohibiting the use of fireworks further protects the surrounding agricultural community and livestock from potential disturbances.
37. The proposed development is designed to respect the agricultural appearance of the property and does not take any active farmland out of agricultural use.
38. Should the venue fail to adhere to any of the conditions of approval, the Development Authority has the authority to take whatever legal means necessary to rectify any infraction. This includes revoking the development permit if deemed necessary.
39. In addition to this, Condition 8 of the approval provides an expiry date of the development approval of October 31, 2021. Should a new permit be applied for upon this expiry date, a review of the operational impacts of the development will be undertaken and considered prior to any further decisions being made. Should any detrimental impacts be observed, or any breach of conditions occur during the approved operation of the facility prior to its expiry, this may impact the issuance of any further planning decisions for a wedding venue use on the property.



40. As a result of this, the development authority consider that the decision to approve Development Permit D20-041 was correctly administered and is appropriately conditioned in response to the concerns raised. Because of this, the planning department consider the decision to approve the development subject to 21 conditions should be upheld by the appeal board.
41. Should the appeal board choose to uphold the decision of the planning department, the board may consider extending the life of the permit to take into account the loss of this summer season for the applicant.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members of development authority staff.

In response to questions by Board members, Mr. Richards advised of the following:

- In March 2020, Leduc County Council passed a bylaw to add Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility to Land Use Bylaw 7-08 under Part 9.2.3 Discretionary Uses of the Agricultural/County Residential Transition District.
- Bylaw amendments must be advertised and the Municipal Government Act sets out strict requirements for advertising. All requirements were followed - advertised for two consecutive weeks in The Representative; in addition it was advertised on the County's website for three weeks.
- The amendment to the Land Use Bylaw was prompted by a submitted application.
- Condition 9 limits operational days and hours. All activities, including cleaning, must end by midnight on Fridays and Saturdays. The best monitoring tool is the surrounding community. The Enforcement department is available around the clock and could investigate. Should the facility be operating outside the allowed hours, enforcement measures can be taken.
- Before the venue opens, the applicant must have a conversation with the Engineering department to inquire if dust suppression is required.
- The applicant is working with Safety Codes staff to ensure sewage codes are adhered to. Will be installing a cistern and holding tanks as required.
- Conditions have been outlined to deal with noise concerns which could affect neighbors' livestock. The facility is within the forested area and fireworks are not allowed.
- Non-compliance of the conditions could be a criminal offense. Other enforcement measures would be applied first, e.g., stop order.
- If venue is serving alcohol outside of permitted hours, RCMP can enforce this and could possibly press charges. County Enforcement Services will enforce the permitted hours of operation.
- County Enforcement Services can drive by the venue during an event but it is not one of the conditions of the permit. Most issues are complaint driven. If the County receives complaints, they would investigate and take action if necessary.
- All discretionary permits must have some conditions applied. Letters of concern are reviewed and those concerns are addressed through the decision making process.
- If the development is approved, the applicant will be expected to make application for a sign permit.



Chair McDonald called upon the appellant(s), to make their presentation.

Karen Neilson, appellant, provided the following information:

1. Reside about 200 metres east of proposed development site. Consider themselves most affected by this development. Have many concerns.
2. The applicants do not live on property. They live in the city and use the residence as a weekend getaway or for vacation in the summer.
3. Believe this business is detrimental to the quiet agricultural community and enjoyment of surrounding area.
4. This facility is exceptionally large and holds 230 guests and 80+ vehicles.
5. The permit notes this is a wedding and agricultural facility but no mention on the website or Facebook page of agricultural use or events. The initial permit states this facility is for agricultural events. Feel this is misleading to County administration and is just a way to comply with discretionary use (9.2.3) and make this facility more favorable to fit into the community. It appears that the facility's main purpose is to hold wedding events, a highly lucrative business. This goes against Bylaw 7-08 (9.2.1).
6. Concerned that noise from the reception, music, DJ, vehicles, patrons yelling, cheering/speaking over the microphone system will negatively affect livestock. Tent and trees are not adequate sound barriers. In fact, they are removing many of the trees in the area for the tent and buildings.
7. How much time do residents have to spend filing complaints to the County or to the RCMP. People in this community are busy and should not be expected to spend time repeatedly having to deal with these concerns.
8. Feel that this event center will interfere with the amenities of the neighborhood. Will affect way of life, livestock, harvesting of crops, and will have a financial impact on farmers production and property values.
9. Will affect ability to harvest crops and rent pasture to others with livestock due to their concern of injury to animals.
10. Site description by the planning department notes that this proposed site has 13.5 acres of trees and the remainder of the 79 acres is pastureland. This property is not pastureland but is hay land that is rented out each year and farmed by surrounding farmers who use this hay to feed their livestock. This distinction is important as pastureland would only minimally affect events at this facility but harvesting of hay will create dust, noise, etc. that would likely be objectionable to those holding weddings. Patrons who rent this facility are not going to want the dust and noise of a farmer cutting hay when a wedding or reception is taking place.
11. Farmers use the range road throughout the year to transport farm equipment. If cars are parked along the roadway because the parking lot is too muddy or wet, farmers will be impeded from doing their job in a timely and safe manner.
12. The Applicant's website boasts a 1000 watt Bluetooth speaker system with wired microphone. Feel that loud music with people talking and yelling over the system will be disturbing to nearby people and livestock. Loud noise can cause animals to spook, run and display other anxious behaviors. This happened at a previous event on this property. Provided information related to noise frequencies and its affects on animals and wildlife. Also provided information presented by a veterinarian who testified for people who were

against an event venue in the U.S. similar to this type of facility. Do not feel permit addresses safety of animals.

13. We own and breed Tennessee Walking Horses.
14. Attended a wedding on this property in the past. Had fireworks on our driveway because it was the safest place. Were trying to be good neighbors. We were disturbed by the noise which went until 0200-0300 in the morning and there were guests walking onto our property.
15. People can be negatively affected by noise exposure. Chose to live in Leduc County because it is quiet and not disruptive. Feel that this facility will reduce property values in the community. Don't feel sufficient measures have been taken to protect neighbors.
16. Don't understand how they can enforce the maximum of 230 people. There is no mention as to how this will be enforced by the County or developers.
17. Limiting operational times does not stop noise from occurring.
18. We are shift workers and noise from the events will interfere with our ability to sleep, leading to associated health concerns. This facility could impact our quality of life.
19. Researchers found that loud music / environmental music is associated with an increase in alcohol consumption. Don't feel that conditions set by County do enough to address these concerns.
20. Statistics show that alcohol related accidents happen mostly on weekends. According to statistics, the event centre would likely contribute in all possible ways to an increase in the number of fatal and injury collisions related to impaired driving. Statistics related to impaired driving were provided.
21. Light pollution from facility will negatively impact neighbors, livestock and wildlife. Provided information on light pollution. Noted that there are areas that are cleared so to state that this is dense forest and will mitigate the effects of light pollution is again misleading.
22. The County reports that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the local road network, however, adding extra vehicles on the road each weekend will impact the roads and residents. Alberta Traffic Collision statistics were provided.
23. Concerns with safety and security of property / trespassing. "No Trespassing" signs to not prevent curious or bad intentioned people from entering a property. Intoxicated individuals are more likely to take risks. Guests may take note of what our residents have on their property and return at a later date to steal. Statistics on rural crime were provided.
24. There are already drainage concerns on this site. This facility will add to the problem. Increased clearing of trees to facilitate tents and buildings and a 5,000 square foot concrete pad will no doubt affect the drainage. The large parking lot will also affect drainage. Provided photos.
25. Applicant has no official plan for septic system. The land to the north is labelled as environmentally significant.
26. Will be an increase in litter and garbage around the area. We pick-up garbage from this surrounding property because no one is around to do it. Provided photos.



27. RCMP in rural areas have enough to deal with. This facility will put an increase on RCMP resources.
28. Fire risk due to smoking from guests and cars parking on dry grassland. Increased response times in rural areas of fire department puts adjacent landowners at risk of loss of property and life. There is no water source nearby for the fire trucks and water has to be trucked in. There is currently only one access into this event centre. No fire or safety plan has been submitted.
29. Possible damage to hay land and agriculture land from vehicles parking and driving on land not designated for vehicles. Possible damage to fencing, gates and other structures will have consequences to livestock as well as a financial impact on farmers.
30. Have demonstrated why this development does not comply with Land Use Bylaw 7-08.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members of the appellant.

In response to questions by Board members, Karen Neilson advised the following:

- Did not know about the amendment to the Land Use Bylaw as they do not receive the Leduc Representative in their area. Checked with their neighbors and they do not get the Leduc Representative either. Had they known about the amendment, they would have expressed their concerns at that time.
- Pointed out where horses graze on the photos.
- Found out about the amendment to the Land Use Bylaw after they received the notification about the proposed development. At no point did the applicant advise the neighbors of his intentions.

In response to questions by Board members, Mr. Richards clarified the following:

- The appropriate and legal process was followed with regard to amending the Land Use Bylaw.
- The amendment is not site specific.
- When this application came in, the package was immediately sent to adjacent landowners. The process was done legally and in accordance with the Municipal Government Act.

In response to questions from Board members, Karen Neilson provided additional information:

- Have just under a quarter section of land.
- Have Tennessee Walking Horses. Brother-in-law also brings his Tennessee Walking Horses to our farm.
- Southern portion of land is in hay which is used to feed animals.
- Usually have approximately 14 horses but can have up to 125 horses on occasion.
- Pointed out neighbors properties on photos.
- Neighbors have the same concerns.
- Neighbors have longhorn cattle and they are afraid that people will want to take selfies with them and potentially get hurt.
- Concerned about fire safety. Not sure how emergency vehicles are going to access site as they don't feel the entrance is adequate.

- Concerned about the road. With more vehicles and septic trucks, this will only add to the issues.
- Concerned about litter. There is already litter on the property and if you add 230 people, there is the possibility of more litter.

### **Recess**

Chair McDonald called a recess at 10:42 a.m., and reconvened at 10:56 a.m. with Board Members Kevin Maine, Pat Rudiger, Rod Giles and Doug Ruel present.

Also present were:

- Joyce Gavan, Clerk
- Lynn White, Recording Secretary
- Colin Richards Team Lead Development
- Charlene Haverland, Manager of Development Services
- Greg McGovern, Planner 1
- Rae-Lynne Spila, Senior Municipal Engineer

Present as well were:

- Kevin and Karen Neilson, Appellants
- Anuj Gupta, Applicant
- Krishna Gupta, Resident
- 10 other residents/interested parties

Chair McDonald requested Kevin Neilson, Appellant to provide his presentation.

1. The decision making at the beginning of the process was flawed which should invalidate everything else.
2. The amendment to the Land Use Bylaw is what is important about this. The bylaw amendment mentions a specific application and the addition of a rural wedding and agricultural event facility as a discretionary use.

Mr. Richards clarified that the amendment to the Land Use Bylaw was part of the original rezoning bylaw and it had to be added to enable the development authority to consider the application before them. At the public hearing, there were no objections received and no one from the public in attendance to speak to the amendment.

Chair McDonald advised that the amendment to the Land Use Bylaw is not the subject of the appeal and advised Mr. Neilson to present facts related to the application before them today.

Kevin Neilson continued with his presentation:

1. Even though this Board cannot change the rezoning, when it comes to discretionary use later on, this is relevant and may sway on the side of opposition.
2. Section 9.2.1 of the Land Use Bylaw states the purpose of this district is to provide primarily for agricultural operations, while at the same time providing for other uses having a secondary role to agriculture. The problem with this application is that the primary use is a wedding facility and there is no mention of an agricultural use. There is no mention of agricultural events in their business information. In the applicant's

promotional material for “Aspen Valley Wedding and Events” there is no mention of agriculture. Therefore, requirements of Section 9.2.1 are not being met.

3. Land Use Bylaw says that development shall not affect neighboring properties. Feel there are big problems with that requirement. Feel that conditions do not address or mitigate the requirement to not interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighboring properties.
4. Had experience with two weddings previously held on this property. Gave us a preview of what to expect. Experienced problems with noise. Why do we need a further two year trial period.
5. Once the facility is in place, it will be more difficult to apply penalties or shut it down after the fact.
6. Do not feel that fire safety concerns and traffic concerns have been adequately dealt with.
7. Feel that 30-50 events per year will interfere with our use and enjoyment of our property.
8. Do not feel that a wedding facility is harmonious to agriculture and will detract from the rural setting.
9. Do not feel that the development authority responded to the number of issues relevant to the community as they were not considered to be planning issues.
10. What will be the outcome of an increase in vehicles and alcohol.
11. This development will impact our use and value of our property.
12. This development is not the right fit for this community. This is a large commercial wedding facility meant to compete with convention centres in the city.
13. Not opposed to economic diversification and development but this does not fit in our community.
14. The large number of people who have opposed this development should not be ignored, particularly when definitions are not being met. Whose opinion matters most - developer or large number of people in area.
15. Traffic issues will affect a broader area.
16. Everybody knows there will be security problems.
17. A permit that allows a facility such as this is in contravention of the Land Use Bylaw.
18. Proposed development does not comply with bylaw requirements.
19. This is a large commercial facility and is not appropriate for this area.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board Members of the appellant, and there were none.

Chair McDonald requested Anuj Gupta, Applicant to provide his presentation.

Anuj Gupta, Applicant, provided the following information:

1. Any good business person will be onsite to operate the business. Will be there to ensure the rules are followed. Am a business person and have never had any citations.
2. All bookings and spending until now have been personal.



3. The County correctly administered the process as per the Municipal Government Act.
4. There were a lot of letters that state that we don't care. We designed the facility so that we weren't impacting anybody in the community. Picked the site where we would have a light barrier, dirt barrier and tree barrier. Several trees are being cleared to allow development within the treed area.
5. There will be a benefit to the business region - pavers, decorators, caterers, etc. Will be reaching out to a number of businesses.
6. The agricultural land is not being negatively impacted.
7. County engineers and departments reviewed the application and they had no concerns regarding traffic, drainage, etc.
8. Designed the site to not impact neighbors with regard to sound, light, parking, drainage and to minimize traffic on Range Road 225.
9. Provided information on noise/decibels and how far it travels.
10. There is very minimal lighting - no street lights and no flood lights. Showed overhead photo of lighting at night.
11. Showed night photo of lighting on the Neilson's property.
12. Designed site with sufficient parking for all attendees and service people to park on private property. There will be no parking on the roadway. Parking space is completely fenced in already so no vehicles would be able to drive onto farmers' fields.
13. There are three other access points onto property. Already have plans to improve road into property.
14. There are already semi-trucks and commercial trailers being driven on the range road.
15. Looked at other sites on property for development. Rejected them because they were not treed in or were too close to neighbors or would be using up agricultural land.
16. Father has been calling adjacent landowners. Most are not returning his calls.
17. There are a couple of neighbors who signed documentation indicating they are not opposed to the development.
18. Economic benefit would be provided through Farmers Markets.
19. There will be no camping on the property.
20. The County development office did not approve a similar venue in the middle of a rural subdivision at 23464 Range Road 505 because the neighbors were less than 50 metres away.
21. The County development office did approve a similar venue at 50376 Range Road 244 and it had no tree cover and the neighbors were within 50 metres.
22. Have been accused of hiding things. Last social post was May 25<sup>th</sup>. Have not done anything since then. Took down photos of the Neilson's horses. Have removed text regarding fireworks.
23. Accused of not caring about the community. My father was on the Cameron Drainage Project and did a very good job.



24. Worked through permitting process and if there is a requirement to apply again, will follow the process again.
25. Accused of trying to keep things under wraps. Have been in contact with Councillor Smith who provided guidance with the process.
26. Have discussed Farmers Markets with the development authority.
27. There will be representatives on site to enforce the rules and operations of the events.
28. Parents live on the property and the family is always excited to visit the farm.
29. Don't pick up garbage on every visit to the property but it will definitely be picked up after each event. No garbage will be left behind after events.
30. No single-use plastics will be used at events.
31. My wife has certification for events management and would like to develop this facility for her.
32. Have an emotional attachment to this property.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members of the applicant.

In response to questions by Board member questions, Mr. Gupta advised the following:

- This year's season has been cut short due to the appeal process. Would like permit extended to 2022 if possible.
- Will continue to lease out farmland.
- Chose to keep facility rustic in keeping with the rural area. There will be surveillance of property lines. Property is all fenced in. Willing to get security to ensure no one goes beyond fencing.
- Deliveries will happen on the actual day of the event.
- Expect to have only one event per day.
- Monitoring of the people during an event will be done by either wife of myself.
- No existing farmland will be taken out of production.
- Will have host insurance.
- Events will include weddings and farmers markets.
- Other wedding venues have been approved in Leduc County.
- Will work with Leduc County to ensure that emergency access requirements and safety codes are followed.

Chair McDonald called upon the registered speakers, stating their name, their legal address and their interest in the appeal (whether for or against the appeal).

The following registered speakers presented their information:

1. Jennifer Huntley, 22548 Township Road 504 - in support of the appeal and against the proposed development for the following reasons:
  - Live approximately 800 metres away from the proposed development.



- Do not get the Leduc Representative so were not aware of the Land Use Bylaw amendment.
- Am alone to take care of livestock on occasion and do not need the extra stress of a wedding and event center disrupting the cattle on the property.
- Support what the Neilson's presented.
- Concerned that applicants do not reside at the property and never have. They are absentee landowners.
- Security will always be outnumbered by the number of people.
- We enjoy the quiet and chose to live in the country to raise children.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members.

In response to questions by Board members, Jennifer Huntley pointed out where her property is located on the County map.

2. Michelle Mitchell, 50319 Range Road 225 - in support of the appeal and against the proposed development for the following reasons:
  - Live south of the Neilson's and farms alone.
  - Have 60 longhorn cattle as well as sheep and guard dogs.
  - Can't control drunken patrons.
  - Worried about people taking selfies with longhorn cattle.
  - If noises spook the animals, they could stampede. Guard dogs may react to people around the property.
  - Just paid \$2,000 to get fencing reinforced around property.
  - Even if RCMP are called, their response time may not be in time to address people who are trespassing.
3. Gus Janke, 50427 Highway 21 - in support of the appeal and against the proposed development for the following reasons:
  - Do not receive the Leduc Representative. If you don't access the Leduc County website on a regular basis, you won't see everything.
  - Cameron Drainage should be notified about development as there is a registered drainage that runs through the proposed development. There is a low lying area that will collect water.
  - The word discretionary is thrown around and it's not very clear.
  - Had conversation with Mr. Gupta about the venue and how there is nothing like this in this part of the County and how it could be beneficial. Agreed to support his proposed development by signing a document. But at that time, only had one side of the story. Afterwards, had conversation with Mr. Neilson and got a few more details. Contacted Leduc County and got a copy of the full appeal package. This application is out of character for this area. With Covid-19, can't believe the County would approve a large event and why they wouldn't put it off for a year. Have concerns with parking, roads, fire hazards, and noise. Now that all facts are known, no longer support this proposed development.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members.

In response to questions by Board members, Mr. Janke advised of the following:

- Live approximately 2 miles to the south of the proposed development.

- Calving takes place from about May to the middle of June. Typically have about 100 head of cattle.

Chair McDonald asked if there was anyone else in attendance that wished to speak to the appeal (first those in favour of the appeal and then those opposed), and there was no one.

Chair McDonald asked the clerk if there was any written submissions received from individuals who have not provided submissions today, and Ms. Gavan confirmed there was none.

### Recess

Chair McDonald called a recess at 12:35 p.m. and reconvened at 12:42 p.m. with Board Members Kevin Maine, Pat Rudiger, Rod Giles and Doug Ruel present.

Also present were:

- Joyce Gavan, Clerk
- Lynn White, Recording Secretary
- Colin Richards Team Lead Development
- Charlene Haverland, Manager of Development Services
- Greg McGovern, Planner 1
- Rae-Lynne Spila, Senior Municipal Engineer

Present as well were:

- Kevin and Karen Neilson, Appellants
- Anuj Gupta, Applicant
- Krishna Gupta, Resident
- 9 other residents/interested parties

Chair McDonald called for summaries and closing comments as follows:

### Development Authority

Mr. Colin Richards provided the following closing statements:

A lot of the concerns we have heard are based around the applicant breaking the rules and conditions specified. As planners, we cannot assume that people obtain development permits in order to break the rules we lay out for them. If they do however, as discussed in our submission, there are many enforcement options available to us that will be perused if necessary.

### Definition of an Agricultural Facility Event

We heard that the name agricultural wedding and event facility is misleading and this application does not accord with the intent of this land use type. Just to clarify this, the Land Use Bylaw contains a clear definition for this use type that states, *"It is a facility that provides for an alternative venue for events within a traditional rural setting and is not intended to locate development that would be better located within defined business and commercial areas. Any use and/or development considered under this definition shall be designed to be agriculturally harmonious by way of design, appearance, scale and form and shall not detract from the rural and agricultural context of the site or its surroundings. Uses may include (but is not limited to) weddings, meetings,*

*seminars, farmers markets and trade fairs.”* Based on this definition we feel that the proposal fully meets this definition and the intent of this land use.

### Property Values

In response to comments about the detrimental impact on property values this event would have, we can advise that planning staff have held discussions with the County’s assessment department as to how significant these devaluations may be.

The response we received was essentially that until a development is in place, assessors cannot comment on property devaluation, but with this said, it was noted that of the 3 agricultural wedding venues that are currently operating within the County, no adjacent property value reductions have been imposed.

During those conversations, the assessment department did advise that within the County, where waste transfer stations have been established, the property value of immediately adjacent lands have not subsequently been diminished.

### Process

I do need to touch on the point being raised concerning the land use bylaw amendment.

I know we’re not here to debate the process for the public hearing, which is a Council process but we can assure the board it was undertaken in accordance with the legal requirements of the Municipal Government Act. The amendment was not site-specific and was therefore not circulated to individual residencies. This is common practice for land use bylaw amendments.

I will just raise that it was stated by the appellant that I personally made a catastrophic error in the amendment process by stating it was referred to adjacent landowners and therefore the process taken should essentially be null and void. We would just like to confirm that during the public hearing, Council were not advised that the application went to any personal addresses, and that addition in the minutes was simply an administrative error within the minutes of that public hearing. When it was noticed a typo was made in the minutes of the Council meeting, Council removed that statement from the record, to acknowledge that they had not been misled that this amendment application had in fact been sent to every individual within the AG/CR-TR District. Although this is not for the appeal board to debate, I will again state that the public hearing process was undertaken lawfully and correctly.

With that said, the development permit application was site specific and as a result the neighbors did receive a personal letter and invitation to comment. This was circulated and advertised in accordance with the requirements specified by Council.

### Agriculture Impacts

We have heard a lot more about Agricultural impacts, so I will just clarify that this application was reviewed by our agricultural services department who held no concerns with the proposed development, providing the use of fireworks was prohibited.

We heard that this property is within an environmentally significant area. I will just confirm that a small area toward the north of the overall property has been identified within the County’s ESA study, however, the majority of the parcel and certainly the area where this development will occur does not fall within a defined environmentally significant area.

This decision was made on planning merits and not assumptions. We cannot assume everyone who attends a wedding will be a criminal or drug addict or drink driver, nor would it be appropriate for planning staff or an appeal board to make such assumptions.

The planning department maintains that the decision was made in accordance with policy and addressed the concerns raised through the 21 conditions of approval.

Should the appeal board choose to uphold the decision of the planning department, the board may consider extending the life of the permit to take into account the loss of this summer season for the applicant.

Chair McDonald asked if anyone had any questions for Mr. Richards.

Mr. Neilson indicated that he felt that the residents in the surrounding community were not properly notified.

Mr. Richards clarified that advertising requirements are laid out in the Municipal Government Act and that the correct process was followed.

Mrs. Haverland clarified the following:

- Leduc County Council regularly reviews communication methods including which local newspapers to advertise. In the past, the Pipestone Flyer and County Market were used, however, now the Leduc Representative is used as it had the widest distribution area in the County.
- Had the bylaw amendment been site specific, the surrounding neighbors would have been notified.

Chair McDonald called upon the applicant for final comments.

Anuj Gupta, Applicant

- Provided information on noise from tractors and trains. Noise levels which may occur at their facility will be consistent with other noises within the community.
- Events are marketed as a rural setting so it is expected that neighbors will be harvesting during an event. People want the agriculture ambience.
- Will be asking guests for their feedback about their experience.
- Do not plan on disrupting any farming operations.

Chair McDonald called upon the appellants for final comments.

Karen Neilson, Appellant

- We can agree to disagree on a lot of points. Just can't see a bride in a white dress and white shoes walking around on a farm. Don't think people from the city will want someone cutting hay while they're conducting their wedding. There's dust and noise from cutting hay.
- Realize that if this development goes ahead, there is no detrimental effect through the County assessment on property values, however, if a realtor asks what's around your property, you have to disclose what's surrounding you. Don't think people will line up to purchase property



across from an event centre especially if there's another piece of property that's similar with no event centre across the road.

- Applicant has not clearly defined how he will deal with the noise concerns. Will he or his wife been on the property to monitor activity. Will there be penalties for people breaking the rules.
- Castrol Raceway is several miles west of Highway 2 but on a quiet night we can hear the drag racing. To say that a property 200 metres away is not going to be bothered by the noise is inaccurate. Don't think earth barriers or tree barriers will stop the noise.
- Feedback and surveys are good, however, they are after the fact. If a developer wants to create a trust with that community, you don't send out surveys after and ask what the problem is.
- People who rent a facility needs liability insurance, but it doesn't protect us or neighboring property. If any injury should happen to us or our animals, shouldn't have to expect us to go through lawyers to recoup losses.

#### Kevin Neilson, Appellant

- Our house is on a hill and we have a direct eye-shot of the proposed development. There are no earth barriers that will attenuate the sound. It will affect us, particularly given our previous experience. Why is it our burden to convince the Board that this will negatively impact the community.
- Request that the Board consider the wording of the bylaw and that it will negatively impact this community. A large number of people have expressed concerns that this proposed development is not agriculturally harmonious. Because a wedding facility is a discretionary use, hope that the Board will consider this during their adjudication.
- The notification process does not meet the legal requirements of the Municipal Government Act. There are three methods of communication. One of those requires a circulating newspaper. The Leduc Representative is not circulated to everyone. Lack of communication is most definitely a problem.
- The Applicant says he is willing to work with the development authority and will try to comply with all the conditions. Forgive us for not having faith in this. He has been communicating with everyone except the affected people. There seems to be a bias put on us that we will be inconvenienced or affected by the decision. We find ourselves behind the eight ball in this whole thing. Don't believe the burden should be on us to prove as it affects our use and enjoyment of our land.

Chair McDonald asked the Appellants, Kevin and Karen Neilson if they feel they received a fair hearing, and they responded affirmative.

#### Conclusion of Hearing

Chair McDonald declared the Hearing concluded at 1:14 p.m.

#### Recess

Chair McDonald called a recess at 1:17 p.m., and reconvened at 2:25 p.m. with Board Members Kevin Maine, Pat Rudiger, Rod Giles and Doug Ruel present.

Also present were:

- Joyce Gavan, Clerk
- Lynn White, Recording Secretary

### **In-Camera**

**23-20** Board Member Giles -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meet in-camera.

Carried

The in-camera session commenced at 2:26 p.m.

### **Revert to Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Meeting**

**24-20** Board Member Giles -- that the in-camera session revert to the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting.

Carried

The in-camera session reverted to the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting at 3:31 p.m.

**Appeal by Keven & Karen Neilson & +82 other Leduc County residents relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-041 by Anuj Gupta for a rural wedding and agricultural event facility with frame and fabric structure and two trailers each located at NE 19-50-22-W4 (50352 Range Road 225)**

---

**25-20** Board Member Giles -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (ISDAB) deny the appeal by Kevin & Karen Neilson & +82 other Leduc County residents and conditionally approves Development Permit Application D20-041 by Anuj Gupta for a rural wedding and agricultural event facility with frame and fabric structure and two trailers each located at NE 19-50-22-W4 (50352 Range Road 225).

### **Findings of Fact**

1. The Appellants reasons for appeal included the following risks to the residents of Leduc County who surround the proposed development:
  - noise and disruption of cattle, horses or other domestic animals, wildlife and people of this active farming community
  - traffic
  - security/safety
  - alcohol and drug related behavior
  - inability to enforce permit conditions
  - potential violation of fire and safety regulations
  - increased litter concerns
  - impact on adjacent land
  - impact on community/county facilities - reduced potential for use
  - reduction in farm property values
  - light pollution
  - process problems
  - previous experience
  - not the right fit
  - Leduc County Bylaw 7-08 requirement for approval for this development permit
  - protection of agricultural operations
  - lot requirements



- environmental concerns (tree clearing, drainage)
- 2. The Applicant provided information to address the Appellants' concerns including:
  - history of property and business experience
  - tree clearing to minimize the impact of agricultural land taken out of production, noise and light effects as well as an earth barrier ( $\pm 10$  ft.) to the east, south and west of the venue
  - evidence of the sound attenuation calculator to address the noise effects on immediate adjacent landowners
  - parking design
  - impact of traffic on county roads
  - enforcement of gatherings to ensure safety and compliance with Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission
- 3. The Development Authority conditionally approved Development Permit Application D20-041 with 21 conditions to address the concerns expressed by the community.
- 4. The subject property is districted Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional (AG/CR TR) District in accordance with the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw 7-08. Part 9.2.3 allows a Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility land use to be considered within this district.
- 5. The Board heard from the Appellants and speakers that they were not consulted in the Land Use Bylaw amendment to allow a rural wedding and agricultural event facility as a Discretionary Use. Leduc County Council is the governing body to approve Land Use Bylaw amendments and the Board has no jurisdiction in this regard.
- 6. The purpose of Section 9.2.1 of the Land Use Bylaw states use is to provide primarily for agricultural operations, while at the same time providing for limited residential and other uses having a **secondary** role to agriculture.
  - The Appellants indicated the use as a wedding facility is not secondary to agriculture use.
  - The Applicant indicated the potential to partnership with the community for a farmers market and/or other community events to be held on Sundays.
  - The Board considered the definition of "*secondary*" means not a primary or main concern.
- 7. There will be no agricultural land taken out of production, as the facility will be located within the treed area, as shown on the site plan.

The Board considered the following legislation in making their decision:

Land Use Bylaw 7-08

In accordance with Part 9.2.1 of the Land Use Bylaw, the purpose of the Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional District is to provide primarily for agricultural operations, while at the same time providing for limited residential and other uses having a secondary role to agriculture.

Part 9.2.3 allows a Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility land use to be considered as a discretionary land use within the Agricultural/Country Residential Transitional District.

Part 3.5.1 directs that the development authority may approve a discretionary use if in its opinion, the proposed development complies with the Municipal Development Plan and the general purpose of the land use district.



Part 3.5.2 directs that when considering an application for development, the development authority shall consider compatibility with the surrounding lands, the suitability of the site for development, the capacity of public roads to accommodate potential traffic generation and the ability for infrastructure to accommodate the potential development.

The Board concludes:

- The Board has jurisdiction under Section 687(3)(c)&(d) to confirm, revoke or vary a development permit or any condition.
- The proposed development conforms with the discretionary use prescribed for the land within the Agricultural / Country Residential Transitional District (AG/CR TD) of the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw.

#### Conditions for Approval

Development Permit Application D20-041 is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is granted based on the information provided by the applicant for the approved development only and no other development.
2. The approved development shall be located as shown on the attached approved site plan. Any new approaches represented on the site plan are regarded as conceptual only and shall be applied for through a separate approval process.
3. An access approach application is required to be submitted for the proposed access approach.
4. The Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility shall not impose any impact on adjacent and nearby properties, such as noise, smoke, steam, odor, dust, vibration, glare or traffic that is offensive or excessive in the opinion of the development authority.
5. The approved Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility shall not be allowed to operate until any required safety code permit(s) have been issued.
6. The applicant shall conduct a Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of Leduc County Engineering & Utilities and follow all recommendations contained in the report prior to operating the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility.
7. Prior to the use of the facility, the landowner and operator of the Rural Wedding Agricultural Event Facility must obtain an Occupancy Load Certificate and secure authorization from the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission.
8. The owner/operator of the facility will be responsible to obtain a Liquor License for each event in the name of Aspen Valley Wedding and Events Centre.
9. The applicant shall provide on-site security by a third party for each event.
10. Approval is granted until October 31, 2022. On or before October 31, 2022 the Rural Wedding & Agricultural Event Facility use shall cease unless a new development permit allowing for this use is issued.
11. All events shall be limited to Fridays and Saturdays between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m. (midnight), and on Sundays between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.
12. The facility is permitted to hold events between the first day of the month of May and the last day of the month of October.
13. There will be no more than 80 guest passenger vehicles on site at any given time.
14. There shall be no parking of vehicles within a Leduc County road right-of-way.





15. There will be no more than 230 guests on the property at any given time, or the maximum number of guests prescribed by the Occupancy Load Certificate, whichever is less.
16. The use of fireworks in association with events is prohibited.
17. Outdoor storage of materials associated with the Rural Wedding and Agricultural Event Facility is prohibited.
18. The perimeter of the facility area will be fenced to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.
19. The site shall be maintained in a neat and orderly manner including the containment of all construction materials and refuse, to the satisfaction of the development authority.
20. The development shall not cause any adverse drainage impact on adjacent properties or flooding of nearby ditches in excess of their capabilities.
21. All new accesses, approaches or upgrades, including driveways required off of a Leduc County public roadway, as a result of the development shall first require an Access Application to be provided to the satisfaction of, and approved by Leduc County Public Works and Engineering.
22. The event venue building shall not be used as a dwelling unless specifically approved as a dwelling by a separate development permit.
23. The applicant/landowner shall provide firefighting access at all times to the satisfaction of Leduc County Fire Services.
24. No further development, expansion or change in use is permitted unless approved by Leduc County.

The applicant is also advised of the following:

1. This Development Permit is issued under the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw 7-08. It does not exempt you from compliance with any other municipal bylaw or statutory plan applicable to the approved development, any relevant federal and provincial statute or regulation, or any easement, covenant, agreement or contract affecting the subject lands.
2. The County administers the Safety Codes Act and you must obtain any Safety Codes (building, electrical, gas or plumbing) permit(s) required prior to commencing construction. Increased setback distances from property lines, and/or modifications to plans for proposed buildings may be required in order to achieve compliance under the Alberta Safety Codes Act.
3. To contact Leduc Public Works & Engineering at 780-979-6185 regarding approach approvals and Road Use Agreements as required.
4. To contact Leduc County Fire Services at 780-955-7099 regarding compliance with the Alberta Fire Code.
5. Please be advised that this development may initiate inspections from the Assessment Department. If you would like to schedule an appointment or have questions, please contact the Assessment Department at 780-955-6412.

Development Permit D20-041 shall expire after one year from the date of decision unless development has commenced.

Carried



**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting will be held at the call of the Chair.

**Adjournment**

**26-20** Board Member Maine -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be adjourned.

Carried

The Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting concluded at 3:34 p.m.

  
Chair

  
Clerk