

PUBLIC HEARING

January 24, 2023

2:00 p.m.

Hearing Held in Council Chambers and via Electronic
Communications

**Bylaw 1606/22 Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 1385/17 –
Redistricting of a portion of Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168 from
AG – Agriculture District to INS – Institutional**

RECORD OF SUBMISSIONS

PUBLIC HEARING

January 24, 2023

2:00 p.m.

Hearing Held in Council Chambers and via Electronic
Communications

**Bylaw 1606/22 Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 1385/17 –
Redistricting of a portion of Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168 from
AG – Agriculture District to INS – Institutional**

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Mark and Cara Scott	Opposed
Ken and Kim Josak	Opposed
Rose Poitras	Opposed
Dwayne Poitras	Opposed
Sharlene Poitras	Opposed
Paul Badgley	Opposed
Jarren Poitras	Opposed
Susanne Cote	Opposed
Mark Gordon	Opposed
Matt and Jaclyn Maat & Family	Opposed

Mark & Cara Scott
54502 Range Road 260

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

January 21, 2023

Sturgeon County Council
9613 100 Street
Morinville, AB
T8R 1L9

Dear members of Sturgeon County Council,

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed bylaw 1606/22. As property owners on range road 260, we strongly believe that this bylaw, if implemented, would have a negative impact on the area and would not serve the best interests of the residents. Our main reasons for opposition are listed below.

Uncertainty of Future Development/Use:

- Currently the purchaser states that the congregation consists of only 10 families; however, with a purchase of this size they clearly have plans for future growth. This would result in a need for a larger parking lot, increased traffic, and possibly additional/different buildings. The letter from Hosanna Protestant Reformed Church itself references future subdivision and growth, so their intent for this has been stated.
- With such a small congregation making a purchase this costly, it is fairly safe to assume that they would rent out the facility to generate income. This is a practice most Church's employ, so it is likely that Hosanna Protestant Reformed Church would as well. We have no assurance as to what these rental uses would be, how often they would occur, how much traffic this would generate, what noise would result etc. This would also bring an influx of unknown people into the area who would not otherwise be here, which raises a concern around rural theft and safety.

Reduction of Property Value:

- Residents on Range Road 260 have already endured a reduction of property value on our tax assessments due to the designation of the road being the main access to Pro North Industrial Park. This would be documented by the County as there were several meetings and discussions held. Residents hoped the improvements to Township 544 would alleviate this and allow us a recovery of our property value. Permitting this redistricting would further increase our traffic and negate the positive affect of 544.
- Historically, property owners on the road have had a difficult time selling, due again to the designation of Range Road 260 as an access road. Allowing this redistricting would amplify this issue. Potential buyers may view having a neighboring Church property as unappealing, and they may also have concerns about the uncertainty of future growth and development.

Contrary to Existing Subdivision Bylaws:

- The parcel of land in the proposed amendment has already been subdivided as allowed under the existing bylaws. These bylaws exist to conserve agricultural land in the county and to limit residential density. Allowing an exception by granting further subdivision of this parcel would be contrary to the current bylaws, and would set precedence for other landowners to subdivide/rezone outside of these bylaws. This would further erode the rural character of the area and we would now have no guarantee of what could be developed on the land surrounding us.
- The proposed land redistricting is out of character for the area and is inconsistent with the surrounding land use. When we purchased our property we did so knowing that the land around us was designated agricultural with no existing plans to change. We moved to the country for the space and the tranquility. If we wanted an area with a more urban feel, we would have chosen to remain in the city or move to an acreage subdivision. Our conversations with neighbours reflect the same feelings.

We urge the County Council to carefully consider the negative impacts that this proposed bylaw would have on area residents and to reject it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark and Cara Scott

January 22, 2023

Legislative Services

Sturgeon County, Alberta

To whom it may concern,

We wanted to take this opportunity to provide our input on proposed Bylaw 1606/22 and the proposed redistricting of a portion of land within Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168 from AG-Agriculture District to INS – Institutional District. We oppose the proposed redistricting for the reasons outlined below.

We own the second residence currently located within this parcel of land. We purchased this acreage over a decade ago with the understanding the parcel had been subdivided to the maximum. Sturgeon County boasted their priorities to preserve farmland and offer a quality county living experience. This provided us with the peaceful country life we desired and drew us to Sturgeon County and this property. Redistricting would compromise our own peaceful county living lifestyle and that of the entire community.

In the applicant's concept letter they state: *"We believe the rezoning of this land would be necessary to create a logical parcel configuration for future subdivision and to allow us some room for long-term growth."* We liked that our property was not a Country Estate Residential property as this setting was more crowded than we wanted for ourselves. We liked that we were not surrounded with neighbors that resembled city life in any way. Should the land be redistricted to the Institutional category it will be like having the City next door.

The Church's desire to grow will inevitably mean more people, noise, and disturbance. Future growth could be varied but it seems likely common Church ventures such as private camps, funerals homes, or community buildings, etc could easily be accommodated in land already having the Institutional Districting category. All of these would mean the coming and goings of more and more people for a wide variety of reasons at all hours of the day and night. Potentially weddings, funerals and other events could be a regular occurrence. Possibly some of these events would involve alcohol which always poses a safety risk for all nearby. With crime on the rise, the presence of many non-residents would be a threat to our safety and security.

One drawback we already have negatively affecting our peaceful and quiet lifestyle is the noise, dust, and disturbances from ProNorth Industrial Park traffic. This traffic tends to occur mostly

Monday thru Friday during daytime hours. According to the applicant's letter their busy times with traffic coming and going will be exactly opposite the ProNorth traffic. The Church will have members and visitors coming and going during the evenings and on weekends. There will no longer be any lulls in traffic, dust and noise on Range Road 260. In addition, we commonly have grandchildren playing in our yard on weekends and the increased traffic will be a safety concern.

Considering all mentioned above, we believe the concerns outlined above would decrease our property value. No longer would we be able to offer a quiet, peaceful country living environment. As such we have no alternative but to oppose the redistricting from Agriculture to Institutional. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken and Kim Josok

Portras 260
54414 RR
Sturgeon County AB
[REDACTED]
Jan 17 2023
Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

Sturgeon County
Public Hearing - Bylaw 1606/22
Amendment to the Land Use Bylaw 1385/17

Attention Jonathan Heemskerk:

We are apposing the Medistrict portion of land within Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168 from AG to INS.

Your vague letter to notify of this change was received Thursday Jan. 12/23 to rezone. Nothing saying the details of what was to be allowed in that residential yard. Dwayne called you immediately upon receiving and left a message. Never received a return call till the afternoon of Monday Jan 16/23. Had already contacted Counsellor, neighbors, etc to find out a "Hosanna Protestant Reform Church" was who applied. There already is a Protestant Reform Church west not far down Villeneuve Road that was built just a few years ago.

- Reasons for Apposing
1. To approve, this is allowing building a huge church and parking lot and anything else with events that could be going on daily.
 2. We do beleive registered church organizations (which was done just in Sept/22) are exempt from paying property taxes. This will create lost tax revenue from that house, shop and yard.
 3. We are taxed on value of our property which is rated too high for a resale. This because of heavy hauling truck traffic. A church traffic another overload of traffic.

Road- RR 260

1. This road does not qualify or in any condition for the industrial heavy hauling going steadily. Every winter many times in the ditch on the sharp curves causing us to have to turn around, go around when we are metres from home. Add families of church events you are looking to experience diasters. This road heavier with traffic yet since paving 544 from Pro North to Highway 2.
2. We bought, built and live on agriculture land on a acreage that allowed having two acreages per eighty acres. These are all filled will homes or owned. This was the purpose of this RR 260 and farmers access to their land.

What did Sturgeon County do to Prairie Gardens because of too much traffic?? Closed down a producer of agriculture products of food product, teaching agricultural knowledge and entertaining our younger generation. Shut down, then controlling people because of too much traffic. Prairie Gardens is a benefit to this county because of food supplied. My question is A church on road that is over used and unsafe??

As residents on RR 260 property owners we the undersigned oppose this redistrict for this purpose

Rose Poitras: _____

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

Dwayne Poitras: _____

Sharlene Poitras: _____

Paul Badgley: _____

Tarren Poitras: _____

Susanne Cote: _____

54430 RR260

STURGEON COUNTY

Added Concern: That property gets water supply from a Sistren Church events several times per week increases heavy volume of traffic will also create water hauling up and down this road. Extra garbage hauling created from a residential property with church events.

Opposition to Land Use Bylaw Amendment

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Bylaw 1606/22, amendment to land use bylaw 1385/17. Having just purchased the 2.47 acres (Plan 0324923, Block 1, Lot 2) across the range road from the proposed land amendment, I have numerous concerns that I hope the county will take into consideration. For years I had planned to find a nice, quiet place to building my forever home. Through exhaustive searching I finally found a beautiful location in Sturgeon County. In late 2022 I purchased the acreage, with plans to build my forever home. This rezoning would force me to rethink my plans entirely. Further to this:

- Traffic: Allowing a church and further development would cause an increase of traffic along the road. Not only would this increase noise in the area, but would also negatively affect the conditions of the road. This would also cause increased costs to maintain or improve the road.
- Noise: Along with the increased noise from traffic, there is also the increase of noise due to church events or other events such as weddings, graduations, or other celebrations. Those who live in this area have done so with the intent to escape the loudness of the city.
- Land usage: The proposed amendment also notes that there is intent to further subdivide. Not only would this amplify the traffic and noise, but it also takes away from additional farmland. The county has bylaws in place to ensure farmland is not destroyed (i.e. limiting the number and size of subdivisions). While the application has expressed intentions on what it will do (hours/operations), there is nothing stopping these from changing if this is approved.
- Property value: With the above noted concerns in mind, the property value of the surrounding areas are likely to drop. There are many long term and new residences in the vicinity that would be negatively affected. Furthermore, it may deter current land owners from developing in this area.

In summation, the approval of the noted amendment would negatively affect the surrounding tenants and property owners. I also do not believe this would provide any positive benefits to Sturgeon County.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mark Gordon

Opposition to Land Use Bylaw Amendment

This letter is to serve as our opposition to the proposed amendment of the Land Use Bylaw regarding the land within **Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168**.

We are the property owners of the quarter section of land west of Range Road 260 that touches the highway (NE 36 54 26 4). We are currently in the process of building our "forever home" which we've been working towards and planning for the last decade. We are looking forward to moving out to the country, getting away from the noise and amenities of the city, and enjoying the nature and tranquility that comes with country living. We have spent a significant amount of time and money securing the land, developing it, and beginning to build our country home.

We oppose the proposed amendment to the Land Use Bylaw concerning Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 0324168 for several reasons, as detailed below:

- **Increased traffic:** The residents of RR 260 were quite happy that Township Road 544 was finally redone this year, which should reduce the amount of traffic that goes North on Range Road 260 (and we believe was one of the motivating factors for the county to carry out the road modifications). We, like many of the other residents, have young children and were very happy at the prospect of reduced traffic - both from a noise, and a safety standpoint. We are looking forward to spending weekends sitting on the deck listening to nature and living in a generally quiet area. Having a church across the road will significantly add to traffic, especially on the weekend, when we're all at home trying to enjoy the quiet. The increased traffic will also add to dust disturbance and road wear. The current estimations of congregation size may seem low, but there are zero guarantees that it won't grow exponentially, especially with the amount of space that the existing shop on the property provides. We anticipate the congregation size will HAVE to grow to be able to afford the cost of the property (currently advertised at \$1.6 million).
- **Increased noise:** People move to the country to 'get away from it all'. They move there for the quiet, for the nature, for the solitude. Having a church facility on 260, though it may be quiet during mass, creates the potential for all kinds of other noise issues - be it the increased road traffic all weekend long, the potential for church parties (as outlined in the proposal, 7 am to 10 pm once a month), or most concerning - the use of the church as a rental hall/facility for events like weddings and other celebrations that will no doubt generate a significant amount of noise (not to mention the potential for patrons, who may be consuming alcohol, to spill out into the surrounding areas). There is nothing in the bylaw amendment that would limit the congregation's use of the land as an event space, nor are there any firm bylaw requirements of how often they can meet on the site as a congregation. Rough hours of operation estimates were provided to the county, but years from now there will be no legal binding to those estimates.

- **Reduced land value:** As mentioned, we own a quarter section of land. As part of our future plans, we hope to subdivide and sell off one or two residential parcels to recoup some of our capital input, as most other farmers/land owners do (within the existing framework of the land use bylaws). As part of the financial math we used to purchase the property, we assumed certain values for the subdivided parcels based on market value in the area. A church, with its increased traffic and noise, will no doubt reduce the value of properties in the area and affect resale. Before purchasing our quarter section we previously owned the 2.47 acre parcel directly across the street from the proposed amendment. This was sold this year, and I can't begin to imagine how unhappy the new owners must be to have this proposal right across the street from them, not to mention the houses directly to the north and south.
- **Existing subdivision bylaws:** The current Land Use Bylaws for Sturgeon County specify that each quarter section may be subdivided into two ~80 acre parcels with two 2.47 acre residential parcels (Section 11.1.3). The purpose of these bylaws, as we understand them, is to make sure that agricultural land in the county is preserved and to limit residential density. In our experience with our own lands, the county is generally (and understandably) very sticky with these rules. These subdivisions have already occurred in the parcel of the proposed amendment. According to the existing bylaws, this parcel should not be allowed to be further subdivided. Allowing the residence on the ~76 acre parcel to be subdivided away from the rest of the agricultural land puts TWO parcels that have a residence on them on that half section, leaving roughly another 73 acre parcel (that, by my understanding of the existing bylaws, can technically also have a future home on it - Section 5.5). Allowing this piece of land to be subdivided and rezoned is contrary to existing bylaws, and sets precedence for future landowners to subdivide/rezone beyond the existing established bylaws, thus impacting the previously mentioned preservation of agricultural land and residential density. We believe that the county has a duty to existing county residents and landowners above all else and that the negative effects on residents in the area outweigh the positives for the potential new landowners. There is little doubt that there are other options available to a potential church that would have less impact on residents in the county, likely in an area already zoned for higher traffic and residential density.

Thank you for hearing our concerns,

Mike and Jaclyn Maat & Family