

PUBLIC HEARING

August 22, 2023

1:30 p.m.

Hearing to be Held in Council Chambers and via Electronic
Communications

**Bylaw 1623/23 – Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 1385/17 – Redistricting
of a Portion Lot 1, Block 1, Plan 092 2252 (55010 Range Road 231) from
AG – Agriculture District to AG2 – Agriculture 2 District**

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Received as of August 17, 2023

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---------|
| 1. | Jason and Terra Slaby | Opposed |
| 2. | Kevin and Roxanne Theroux | Opposed |
| 3. | Verna and Maurice Theroux | Opposed |
| 4. | Mitchell Yaremko | Opposed |
| 5. | Justin and Aundrea Julio | Opposed |
| 6. | Jason and Nadine Stang | Opposed |
| 7. | Kelvin Kozak | Opposed |
| 8. | Launi Julio | Opposed |
| 9. | Dan Julio | Opposed |
| 10. | Ken and Michelle Theroux | Opposed |
| 11. | Rob Paradis | Opposed |
| 12. | Conrad and JoAnn Gaumont | Opposed |
| 13. | Marsha Paradis | Opposed |
| 14. | Kaitlyn Eyestone | Opposed |
| 15. | Lee and Colette Watrin | Opposed |

From: [Terra Slaby](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 11, 2023 5:14:59 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

Please accept this letter as our objection to the proposed Bylaw 1623/23, specifically:

Bylaw 1623/23 – Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 1385/17 – Redistricting of a Portion of SE-2-55-23-W4M (55010 Range Road 231) from AG – Agriculture District to AG2 – Agriculture 2 District

We, along with our young children, reside in a neighbouring property to the above. We will be, and already have been, directly affected by the event venue in question. As Council is already very aware, this property has completed renovations without proper permits and has held numerous events that have had a negative impact on our peaceful neighbourhood. Each event has required the resources of our County Bylaw officers and the RCMP due to excess noise and traffic.

The above property is simply not suitable to hold the events outlined in their application. The property has always been, and should remain, a private residence.

We can attest to how unreasonable it is to suggest an event venue at this location. We have experienced just how negatively it impacts our lives and homes.

* During the previously held events, traffic was excessive and worrisome as we witnessed numerous near misses as attendees turned both on and off the highway carelessly. Dust, road wear, and vehicles turning around in private driveways were also problematic. One can also reasonably assume there will be a risk of impaired driving after such events. This stretch of road was not built to handle the unreasonable increase of traffic events will bring.

*Noise was excessive and almost always required a call to the RCMP, who then shut down the event. It was tiresome to deal with the noise during the handful of events already held. We simply cannot imagine having to live next to a property allowed to operate in such a manner full time. It would be downright exhausting for neighbouring families and we'd certainly no longer be able to enjoy the peace of our own homes and yards.

*Water usage on an already overused line, inadequate sewer system, excess garbage, theft, damage to neighbouring properties, livestock and farmland are all areas of great concern. In fact, attendees of past events trespassed on adjacent land for pictures, disrupting livestock and crops.

We implore council to really understand the impact a venue like this will have on the people who live around it and to see just how unsuitable this property is for such development. There certainly may be other areas suitable for rezoning, but this isn't one of them. We thank Council for their time and the opportunity to share our concerns. We hope that you strongly

consider the impact that rezoning will have in areas where families are so closely impacted. We hope to be able to continue to enjoy our peaceful area of young families and old friends and wish for our country community to remain just that.

Kind regards,

Jason/Terra Slaby and family

From: [Kevin Theroux](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Opposed to Public hearing: Bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 14, 2023 4:39:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

To: Alanna Hnatiw, Dan Derouin, Kristin Toms, Matthew McLennan, Neal Comeau, Deanna Stang and Jason Berry

Re: Opposition Against Application 1623-23 for 55010 Range Rd 231

Dear Madams and Sirs,

Please accept this letter of Opposition to the rezoning application 1623-23 for 55010 Range Road 231. I, Kevin Theroux, live at 55119 RR231 with my family. I grew up in the area, and after a brief time spent in time, we moved back to the area because I'm a shift worker working 12 hour rotating shifts between days and nights. The noise and traffic in the city were affecting my sleep patterns and quality. I believe the approval of this application will have a negative impact to my quality of life by disrupting our quiet country atmosphere.

In the recent past, they owners of 55010 Range Road 231 have proven to not respect the neighbors or county by the number of calls to bylaw, RCMP and county staff to control unsanctioned events to date. Information that may be required at development stage, plot, parking, water, wastewater, sound monitoring, traffic, stormwater and erosion and sediment plans were conducted. It appears that the development stage has already begun in 2021 or earlier, before appropriate steps were taken for approval. It was only until a court order was requested that an agreement to cease was finally agreed upon prior to the court order.

I am opposed to the application proposal due to the direct impact the business will have on our community. This would include additional traffic, noise, parking problems and road quality. Please consider the negative impact allowing an event venue to operate over 100 hrs/week in a residential setting will have on the current county residence.

Opposed.

Kevin & Roxanne Theroux

From: [Maurice Theroux](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Opposed to rezoning application
Date: August 14, 2023 4:51:02 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

To: Alanna Hnatiw, Dan Derouin, Kristin Toms, Matthew McLennan, Neal Comeau, Deanna Stang and Jason Berry

Re: Opposition Against Application 1623-23 for 55010 Range Rd 231

Dear Madams and Sirs,

Please accept this letter of Opposition to the rezoning application 1623-23 for 55010 Range Road 231.

I, Verna Theroux, along with my husband, Maurice, are county residents at 55121 RR231. My family moved into the area in 1928. I have lived here for 79 years raising my family in a quiet country setting.

We oppose this change from AG agriculture district to AG2 agriculture District to allow for event venues for weddings, gatherings and other events. A few of our specific concerns include: noise, traffic, potential fire, parking, and water use. These impacts will greatly impact our community in a negative way. As well as the resources already extended from bylaw, RCMP, county staff, and lawyers that were needed to help manage the past issues. I'm afraid approving this application will be an enforcement nightmare in our community. To date, it has been very stressful navigating the past and future impacts.

Please consider the impact this business has on the current and future residences of our county community.

Verna & Maurice Theroux

Mitch and Shawna Yaremko
54517 RRD 232
Sturgeon County, AB
T8E 5L9

August 14, 2023

Legislative Services,
Sturgeon County, AB

RE: Sturgeon County Bylaw 1623/23 – Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 1385/17

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public hearing and comment process for the proposed bylaw 1385/17 to change this parcel to Agriculture 2 District (AG2). We are a neighboring resident in Sturgeon County and are directly impacted; we are opposed to the bylaw amendment for an event venue business.

This bylaw amendment will create significant residual adverse effects to the surrounding rural residents. An event venue business will create negative effects to local residences that are not able to be practically and reliably mitigated. The amendment is not a value-added proposition that considers the best interests for neighboring or adjacent residents.

The main significant local negative effects that will be realized are excessive and frequent noise during the summer period or non-frozen season, substantial increases in local traffic for large events, considerable drain on the existing Landing Trail community waterline, and lastly this event style venue operation is inappropriate for the surrounding local setting and significantly diverges from current bylaw requirements that protects residents from these intrusive uses that would diminish nearby property values.

In the recent past (summer of 2021 and early summer 2022) we have experienced several large family events that this landowner has held that span mid to later afternoon, and into the very late evenings. We have experienced the sound levels escalate in the evenings that we find are excessive and is a detriment to enjoyment of our rural property. In the summer, all residents should be able to spend as much time outside as possible and not be impacted by continuous droning music and noise that is not able to be mitigated once the "party begins". As rural residents we are used to quiet surroundings, and this is counter to the business interests of hosting as many events as possible during the summer and increasing the disturbance for all adjacent and neighboring residents. It is reasonable to predict that the large celebration themed evening events would be able to draw a premium price and it is anticipated they would be continuous over the summer months. The noise related concern for both the frequency of events and timing cannot be practically mitigated, and in our opinion would be excessive. The amendment should not be approved to allow business interests of a single party over local residences and the surrounding communities well-being.

Local traffic increases are a negative residual effect of these large events. Increases in traffic are a major concern for us, we live on Range Road 232 which is one of the main routes to

Highway 37 from the City of Edmonton to the proposed event venue parcel. We have experienced traffic surges from repeated events that this landowner has held in the recent past. These events bring in large volumes of vehicle traffic that we consider to be compounding an unsafe traffic condition for our family. We live directly off Range Road 232 in the “dip in the road” and traffic is unable to see our approach traveling north bound in the line of sight until they are traveling downhill towards it. A large percentage of all traffic travels over the posted speed limit, and there is no way to see kids on the road until very close to the approach, and venue events will increase the frequency of traffic that escalates the risk of a pedestrian collision. The increase in traffic for the attendance of these events is not able to be practically or realistically mitigated. There is no practical way to regulate the travel routes that people will take to a destination / event or to realistically mandate that all participants will take some type of shuttle service based on the type of potential events.

The second considerable traffic risk is on Highway 37 at Range Road 231 both going to and from the proposed event venue. These larger traffic volumes create a greater hazard at that intersection that is not designed to accommodate high turning traffic volumes. There are no established turning lanes on the highway to accommodate high traffic volumes. This development will not safely accommodate residences or event attendees and escalates the risk of a collision.

The proposed event will provide considerable strain on local Landing Trail Water Line that is delivering water to rural residents in the community. A large event style venue will create an inequitable draw on the water resource during the summer months and impact other exiting residential users' pressure during peak use periods. This bylaw amendment is not aligned with equitable water use for this system considering new residential starts are not permitted to join the line due to system limitations.

This bylaw amendment does not appropriately fit with the surrounding community setting for clear reasons mentioned above. In addition, this bylaw amendment would have a negative effect on other adjacent and neighboring residential property values since potential buyers would steer away from being close to this proposed business.

Sincerely,

Mitch Yaremko

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

From: [Justin Julio](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Letter for August 22 Public Hearing: Bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 14, 2023 9:47:04 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

To Whom It May Concern,

Please see below letter to be considered at the August 22, 2023 public hearing.

Our names are Justin and Aundrea Julio, we are county residents at 55013 Range Road 231 that are directly impacted by the proposed Bylaw 1623/23 to redistrict [55010 Range Road 231](#) from AG- Agriculture to AG Agriculture 2 District for the purposes of an event venue and we are **OPPOSED to the Bylaw for the following reasons:**

As adult siblings, we currently reside, with our parents, in the house that is across the road from the property described above. My parents also own the quarter section that our residence is on and this is where we have grown up. Our family's land begins at HWY 37 and runs north on Range Road 231, completely past the proposed Event Venue.

We come from a long line of family farmers and have enjoyed a great life living on the farm in Sturgeon County. Our mother was raised in Sturgeon County and three of her siblings either live or do significant farming in Sturgeon County. We appreciate what it is like to live in this beautiful, peaceful county.

The proposed redistricting property and their owners have done nothing but wreak havoc on the neighborhood. They bought this property and have followed none of the county's rules or Bylaws when they converted it to an Event Venue and held large disruptive parties. Because we live right across the road from them, it has been ridiculously disruptive. There is no way such a small acreage, with residences so close should be acceptable.

The noise from this venue is extremely disruptive, whether it is during the day or evening, since we are right across the road. Not to mention, we have been on the opposite side of our quarter section and on our land that runs to the highway during these events and the sound carries that far in the summer. Because these owners

do not live in the residence, they somehow think noise will not travel, but they are wrong. We could not enjoy our beautiful country lifestyle when these parties were going on. Noise and traffic are excessive.

Both of us have had the opportunity to work from home and even in the house we can hear their noise. Our two dogs go crazy with the sudden or constant noise from the venue. It makes concentration and conference calls impossible. This has and if allowed to continue, will negatively impact our quality of life.

We are not the only ones impacted by this, there are also many neighbors who have complained about noise, traffic, safety and environmental issues to name just a few. These owners have been completely disrespectful to the surrounding neighbors.

As siblings, we were hopeful to have the opportunity to build on this property as our parents have and carry on the farming family life that we have grown up with. We have always planned our homes to be in a location that would now be right across from this proposed redistricted property. This is a sad situation, not only because we are witness to the disruption this has caused in the community but now think about the outcomes of our future with a property like this potentially across from our residences.

For these and many more reasons, we request you decline the above application.

Thank you,

Justin Julio

Aundrea Julio

Redistricting of SE-2-55-23-W4M- 55010 Range Road 231

To Whom it May Concern,

We are located at 55032 Range Road 231 which is the closest neighbour to the North of the applicants. It is approximately half of a mile.

My family has many concerns in regards to the proposed developments.

- The applicant has built many structures on his property before gaining county approval and permits, so we are leary to believe any of the "intends to" or "may install" items outlined in the amendment proposal.

- The applicant refused to ask for permission or attain a permit before holding many large functions on the property. So again, we are leary to believe any of the "intends to" or "may install" items outlined in the amendment proposal will ever come to fruition.

- The applicant is stating that the property will have a 90 vehicle parking lot that is enclosed with trees, however it is not. The vehicles will be clearly seen from range road 231, which in turn is a "paved paradise and put up a parking lot" scenario that we clearly did not intend to ever have to see when we purchased our agricultural/residential property.

The noise mitigation that the applicant has listed is nearly impossible to follow.

"The facility's doors and windows will be sealed."

The applicant cannot ensure that a guest might open a window or prop open the door.

'Doors will remain closed during the events'

The applicant cannot ensure that a guest might open a door for air flow or many other reasons that a guest might have to open a door during an inside event.

Is the applicant going to be on the premises during every event to ensure that the doors and windows to the facility are in fact sealed throughout the evening. Impossible.

The volume of people traffic on range rd 231 will increase significantly. This is a safety concern for the amount of exposure neighbouring properties will be receiving. In turn could potentially bring more crime to our area.

The volume of vehicle traffic turning off of Highway 37 is a concern.

Why do people purchase properties in the country? For the peace and quiet amongst nature. Not to live beside an event venue. There are many other locations in Sturgeon County that would be perfect for a venue. I think the applicant should have done their due diligence before erecting buildings and renovating without the countys approval. If this gets passed then the county is also setting a precedence that anyone can move in and ditch the rules of the county.

We are voting No to the redistricting.

Jason and Nadine Stang

County Letter re:

August 15, 2023

Sturgeon County Mayor and Council,

Re: Public Hearing August 22, 2023 – Bylaw 1623/23 to redistrict 55010 Range Road 231 from
“AG- Agriculture to AG@ Agriculture 2 District “for the purposes of an event venue

I have been a Sturgeon County resident and my family and I have farmed here for 55 years.

- **I am directly impacted by the proposed bylaw**
- **I am opposed to the proposed bylaw for the reasons outlined below**

The Applicant states they want to operate a tent and banquet hall for 200 people with planned operations 7 days a week from 9am to 11pm (weekdays) and until 1am (weekends). This is a quiet residential farming community and a high volume event venue does not meet the requirements for approval.

Sturgeon County's Land Use Bylaw and Event Venue item 6.11A (below) has several requirements which this bylaw application 1623/23 contravenes. More specifically, the business will generate noise, dust, odour, vibration, and refuse. The privacy of the adjacent residential dwellings will not be preserved, and this event venue will and has already directly interfered with the use, enjoyment, and value of neighbouring land and residences.

6.11A EVENT VENUE & COMMUNITY BUILDING 1597/22The business shall not generate noise, smoke, steam, dust, odour, fumes exhaust, vibration, heat, glare or refuse matter considered offensive or excessive by the Development Authority. At all times the privacy of the adjacent residential dwelling(s) shall be preserved and shall not, in the opinion of the Development Authority, unduly interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring or adjacent parcels. Sturgeon County Land Use Bylaw 1385/17 [Consolidated Version] 49 The Development Authority may require any or all of the following with a development permit application or as a condition for an event venue or community building: operations outline or plan, including number of attendees, peak site visits, hours and season of operation, signage, and servicing; traffic impact assessment emergency response plan surveyed site plan; noise impact assessment. If deemed necessary, a noise mitigation plan that may include a noise monitoring system may also be required; community and neighbourhood consultation plan; and/or any other information required by the Development Authority. Development shall provide adequate garbage receptacles and resources, to remove all garbage from the parcel.

I have attached **Table 1** below which identifies the bylaw requirements and current issues which contravene the bylaw requirements. As you can see the number of issues is significant and while some mitigation might be possible it would still not address these issues to the satisfaction of existing residents. As well, the Applicant has a history of non-compliant actions which have abused the good

nature of the surrounding community. The Applicant has had confrontations with neighbours, been untruthful regarding motivations/plans/actions, trespassed on neighboring properties, and intimidated others by videotaped neighbours at their residences. This Applicant is not currently a resident in Sturgeon County. The property has not been occupied by a permanent resident and despite absent residential occupants, loud events were held without appropriate Sturgeon County permits. Sadly, the property has fallen into disrepair (flooded basement, weeds growing unfettered, grass not mowed, snow not plowed on regular intervals) and shows sign of neglect. Responsible agricultural stewards or agribusiness would not take prime farmland out of production by hauling in loads of gravel and neglect even basic land management.

Table 1: County Land Use Bylaw requirements not satisfied.

Sturgeon County Land Use Bylaw REQUIREMENTS	Observed issues which directly contravene the bylaw requirements							
	Noise	Traffic	Safety	Environmental Concerns	Waterline capacity	Property Values	History of non-compliant and unlicensed actions	Applicant Harassing neighbours
Noise	X	X				X	X	
Smoke								
Steam								
Dust		X	X			X	X	
Odour		X		X		X	X	
Fumes exhaust		X		X		X	X	
Vibration	X	X				X	X	
Heat								
glare								
Refuse		X	X	X		X	X	
Privacy of neighbours	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Affect use	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Affect enjoyment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Affect value of adjacent parcels	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Possible full mitigation	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

My concerns fall into a number of categories which include:

- Noise –

- The Applicant had indicated the 200-person event will operate 7 days a week with operating hours which would clearly interfere with the neighbors use and enjoyment of their own properties.
- Proposed noise mitigations will not be adequate. Venue doors are open, and the outdoor tent does not stop the noise from traveling across the quiet country neighbourhood. And as patrons leave, they honk their horns, patrons are outside smoking and talking/shouting which cannot be mitigated by the proposals. Historically when bylaw or law enforcement were called out to the event venue due to noise complaints the owner of the property was not present and it was unclear who had authority to turn off music or make adjustments. This was extremely frustrating for residents who endured multiple nights of events.
- While actions to reduce noise have been identified, no changes were made even after bylaw and law enforcement were called due to noise complaints. Music and announcements could be heard until 1am on the nights they operated the event.
- The Applicant property lines are shared with adjacent landowners and the event venue buildings are very close to neighbouring houses. The event venue is across the road from one existing neighboring residence and adjacent to a yard site of another resident. This event venue is not located in an unpopulated area and site maps provided by the Applicant are misleading (site maps are outdated (10-20 years old)) and do not reflect current yards or houses in the area. Thereby directly affecting resident use and enjoyment of their own properties.
- Traffic –
 - An event venue of this type would result in a significantly increased volume of traffic for an event venue of this size would create noise, dust, exhaust fumes, vibration and safety concerns for current residents.
 - The increased road dust will create visibility issues for traffic on RR 231 and Hwy 37 thereby impacting the safety of residents.
 - Currently the section of Range Road 231 from the event venue to Hwy 37 has issues with washboard, potholes and regular maintenance. Increasing traffic volumes as the proposed would further degrade the condition of Range Road 231.
 - The likelihood of serious accidents will significantly increase liability for Sturgeon County and residents given the speed limit is 80 km/hr on RR231.
 - Parking has been an issue and event patrons have parked along RR 231 and when asked to move they continued to park in approaches along RR 231. Venue patrons proceed to walk and cross RR231 without regard for traffic.
- Safety –
 - Range Road 231 and the approach to Hwy 37 was not intended to have the traffic that would result from a 200-person event venue operating 7 days a week.
 - Events held to date have resulted in patrons not stopping at the stop sign when exiting the event venue onto RR 231 or when turning on Hwy 37 from RR 231.
 - Patrons have been observed backing up on HWY 37 when they have missed the RR 231 turnoff. Given the number of patrons and the number of days of operations the likelihood of a serious automobile accident is much higher.

- As well the Applicant has placed a tent structure over the septic field creating health hazards for attendees who are most likely unaware of these risks.
- It is unclear if appropriate health and safety inspections have been performed for food preparation, washrooms, accessibility for the disabled, building code, etc..
- Liquor will be served at this event venue and this is accompanied by a much higher risk of drinking and driving which elevates the danger to neighbours.
- It is also unclear whether fire or ambulance accessibility plans are in place. Patrons smoke behind the building which creates a fire hazard when there are drought and dry conditions putting neighboring farmer's fields and adjacent neighbour residences at risk.
- There is not access to high pressure fire hydrants should a fire occur further elevating the risk.
- Environmental concerns –
 - The event venue was originally a residence planned for 4 occupants. They are utilizing an undersized septic system for commercial purposes to serve a 200-event venue. They have already had numerous events at the venue without proper septic, water, waste disposal, traffic control or parking. During construction they did not obtain appropriate permits and inspections were not completed – it is unclear what environmental impacts exist from poor construction and waste disposal practices.
 - They have been observed dumping excess concrete in neighboring properties and burying concrete/construction waste behind the event venue.
 - Increased traffic on Range Road 231 would result in significantly increased road dust for neighbouring properties and others that utilize Range Road 231.
- Waterline capacity –
 - Sturgeon County Utilities cannot currently provide waterline service to residents who desire waterline access due to waterline capacity constraints. Why should county residents be prohibited from access to this waterline because of an unapproved commercial venue?
 - This event venue will reduce water pressure to other residents who currently utilize the waterline. This greatly expands the impacted area of this event venue due to the water line pressure issue.
- Property Values
 - Given the noise, traffic, safety, environmental concerns, limited waterline access, history of non-compliance, general neighbour harassment and intimidation by the Applicant there is no doubt property values would be impacted negatively. Moving to next to a commercial event venue that operates 7 days a week would reduce the number of interested buyers for any property adjacent.
 - Because the Applicant did not utilize the correct process to obtain approval for construction of the event venue, adjacent property owners were not advised and have not had an opportunity to provide feedback before the construction was completed.
- History of non-compliant and unlicensed (and possibly illegal) actions
 - Appropriate permits were not obtained by the Applicant and stop work orders were ignored with work being completed at night (midnight to 5am).

- General disregard for community by dumping refuse (concrete) on neighboring properties, trespassing and trampling crops despite repeated requests to stay out of neighbours fields. No trespassing signs were ignored.
- Due to the lack of appropriate permits and how loud events were, bylaw and law enforcement was called to the Applicant property repeatedly. Events continued past midnight without regard for impacts to neighbours who could hear music and microphone announcements past midnight.
- With this history of non-compliance and unwillingness to follow local laws, rules, bylaws etc. it is unclear how enforcement will be handled. When neighbouring residents called bylaw or law enforcement both agencies were unclear on jurisdiction and ability to address the situation further frustrating residents.
- In addition, the Applicant has denied 'for profit' events are occurring at the property and that these are only 'family' events. This is clearly not the case and continue to undermine any trust this community has regarding this Applicant.
- Applicant harassing and intimidating neighbours –
 - The Applicant was observed videotaping neighbours residences and verbally assaulting and threatening other neighbors.
 - Residents have been reluctant to come forward openly regarding this event venue given their fear this Applicant may retaliate.
- Enforcement
 - Given this Applicants history of non-compliance to bylaws, laws and general courtesy for the community who will ensure that Applicant adheres to the rules? They clearly do not believe the rules apply to them and will only comply when forced.

As a result of this issue which are not possible to mitigate and current bylaw requirements it is obvious that this application should be denied.

Regards,

Kelvin Kozak

From: [Launi Julio](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Please accept this letter for submission to the Public Hearing on Aug 22/23 at 1:30pm proposed bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 15, 2023 9:09:05 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

Dear Mayor Alanna Hnatiw and Council members, Dan Derouin, Kristin Toms, Matthew McLennan, Neal Comeau, Deanna Stang and Jason Berry,

My name is Launi Julio, I am a county resident at 55013 Range Road 231 and I am directly impacted by the proposed Bylaw 1623/23 to redistrict 55010 Range Road 231 from AG-Agriculture to AG Agriculture 2 District for the purposes of an event venue and we are OPPOSED to the Bylaw for the following reasons:

Firstly, I want to remind everyone, this property already hosted large scale parties, so we know first hand what they look and sound like and how they negatively impacted the neighbouring community. This application does not align with Sturgeon County's bylaws in generating noise, vibration, dust and refuse matter. With each event either, RCMP, Bylaw enforcement and the County were contacted for support. Additionally, as adjacent residential landowners, we have had our privacy negatively impacted as well as the use, enjoyment and value of our residence and farming parcels, which the Bylaw states should not happen..

These items form our opposition:

- Events held have brought from almost all the neighbors starting south of HWY 37, north up Range Road 231 for 2 miles. **This represents at minimum, 15 families that have significant opposition to this development** with concerns and complaints in reference to issues with traffic, noise, security, safety, agriculture and environmental impacts as well as water and septic issues. Not to mention the non-compliance and disrespect from the owner.
- These applicants are NOT county residents.

- This property is VACANT and no permanent resident has lived there. They have told the county that someone is living there, but we live beside them and with 15 families with a vested interest living on Range Road and driving by all the time, we know no one is living there.
- It is 4.62 acres, which is too small to support an Event Venue, especially so close to residential neighbors.
- During the Agribusiness/Agritourism process, Event Venues of this size were not considered large enough to qualify.
- Strategic Alignment Planned Growth – The AG2 District was recommended through the Agribusiness and Agritourism Review Task Force recommendations, which were designed to provide future-focused planning and investment certainty for those in agribusiness and agritourism industries. This Event Venue is in no way agriculture related. They actually negatively impact our agriculture, for example by trespassing into crops and damaging them and then posting these photos on social media.
- I cannot help but wonder, is this application strategically timed, have they applied knowing the result would be a Public Hearing scheduled during harvest when it is difficult to attend for most farming families?
- Even if the proposed land was a larger parcel, it is too close to our residences to not negatively impact them. The county has to consider the precedent they would set.
- The owners have not contributed positively to the County or its residents, in fact they have only cost time, money and stress, with Stop Work Orders, Court Orders and Bylaw involvement. What would the cumulative cost be to the county to mitigate this situation with non compliant landowners.
- We are tired of how they have treated my family, our neighbors and the County to date. These applicants have already trampled on our rights as residents by trespassing, damaging fields, fences and crops. They have disrespected, harassed, threatened and intimidated. This is completely unacceptable!
- One of the last big complaints changed the landscape with these owners and it was around the time of the Court Order discussions to cease events. There was an

unsettling, threatening situation which occurred that left the surrounding community intimidated and feeling unsafe.

- I think, or at least I hope the owners finally realized they had taken things too far and the events quieted considerably. However, the property continued to be vacant, with rarely any signs of having anyone even check on it. It then incurred significant water damage, and how long before it was discovered. Plus, there didn't appear to be any significant activity that would full repairs. I would worry about mold in a building set to entertain full time parties of 200 people with overnight stays. It's just another item on the long list of concerns about the property.
- In the Application, the owners say there are four bedrooms available for temporary accommodation for customers renting the facility. Would that allow for any owners to be on the property to ensure guests are respectful of neighbors?
- We worry this property has already had a negative impact and decrease in our property values.
- They can promise whatever they want to make things right in their application, but based on all that we have gone through, and continue to go through, we would not trust anything they promise, as they have broken all the rules and completely disrespected our family and surrounding neighbors.
- This experience has resulted in my family and the surrounding neighbors having absolutely NO relationship with these owners.
- Here is a recent prime example of the problems we continue to face:
The applicants have had to hire a consultant to assist them with this application and as part of that, they have a webpage with a satellite picture of their property and location description. The property is only surrounded by crops and there are no residences around them. This is absolutely not true! Our home and farmland is the quarter section directly across the road and there is another residence directly south, sharing a property line with the applicants. They chose to use an outdated satellite picture that shows numerous quarters beside them, yet no mention or depiction of residential impacts. What bothers me is that they are misrepresenting what impacts there may be on residential dwellings. This is exactly what we have been dealing with since they took ownership. If these owners presented this to an audience, like yourselves, and you were not familiar with the area, it would appear this property is in the middle of a bunch of crops. Instead, there are two residences

with direct proximity to this owner that they have not disclosed or addressed this. This does not surprise us at all and follows suit with what we have dealt with from the beginning.

It is unacceptable to live across the road from this and it has already negatively impacted our enjoyment and quality of our life and the application needs to be declined.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but I wanted to include a list of concerns/complaints that the 15 families opposed and impacted by this proposed Event Venue have brought forth over the last 2+ years. They are as follows and are for your reference:

Traffic:

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our community with reference to the following traffic issues we have already witnessed during these events?
- Excessive traffic volumes.
- HWY 37 is overcapacity.
- Speed is already a HUGE problem on Range Road 231.
- Risk associated with alcohol consumption at an Events Venue:
excess speed, impaired driving, and serious accidents, especially with close proximity to a major highway.
- Range Road 231 already has road maintenance issues with existing traffic volumes. This will only increase traffic and require more road maintenance with washboards, divots, and potholes.
- Traffic safety concerns have been witnessed already at previous events with near accidents during these events: failure to obey standard driving laws and due to traffic volumes on HWY 37 and Range Road 231 with plant traffic, trucking and farming equipment traffic in the summer it is a heightened risk. Some infractions witnessed are: failure to obey Stop signs, signals, backing up on the highway, cutting off highway traffic.
-

If the county is aware of these risk factors and proper permits/applications have NOT been followed, who is held accountable if something happens?

- Parking volume issues with 90 cars.
- During previous events, private drivers were parking in neighbour's driveway/approaches and were asked to move, but then continued to do it again. We worry about retaliation.
- Will neighbors be informed if Alberta Transportation/Planning is involved for Roadside Development Permits or any Traffic Impact Assessments that are completed?
- There have already been so many accidents or near accidents with HWY 37 and 21, we cannot imagine an additional 90 cars adding to this during small windows of time.
- There are already issues with vehicles coming from Range Road 232, taking a short jog over on HWY 37, then turning onto Range Road 231 (and vice versa). The impact to cutting off large semi trucks, farming equipment or failing to see motorcycles is common already.

Safety and security:

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our community with reference to the following safety and security issues during events?
- As a tight knit community we work hard to protect ourselves and reduce the draw on county tax dollars by knowing the neighbors in our community to reduce crime in the area. We have achieved this with active community chat groups, Rural Crime Watch and familiarizing ourselves with neighbours. This Event Venue brings in a business volume of traffic that will be unmanageable.
- Increased traffic could lead to increased criminal activities in the area.
- Confirmed alcohol consumption at events increases safety risk for the people who live in this community.
- There are so many families with children, and grandchildren that will be directly impacted with reference to safety concerns with this proposed event venue. The first farming residence between the HWY 37 and the proposed Event Venue, is a family

with 4 young children!

- Due to the non-compliance with permits and inspections, this property is a potential safety risk.
- What about fire and EMS services and measures for things like this. There is not high pressure water to stop a fire in this area covered in residences and crops. Impact would be significant.

Noise:

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our rights as a community with reference to noise issues during these events?
- Excessive noise concerns already experienced with this Events Venue and the owners had zero regard for us as neighbors. RCMP had to be contacted with each event help previously as noise was excessive before and after 11pm. With previous events they moved the loud speakers to different places on the lot, but we were able to hear all of it.
- We could not work in the yard, sit on our deck, invite friends over or enjoy the benefits of our country living without listening to the events going on across the road.
- It was not just immediately adjacent neighbours impacted, as sound carried much further up the road to neighbors residences..
- Honking when approaching or leaving the venue late at night.
- Property owners displayed no regard for the 11pm Bylaw standard, to reduce noise. Noise was only reduced when RCMP was called with previous events.
- We encountered problems with definitions on what “reasonable” noise was, even before 11PM. Why should we have to listen to their music and noise at our residences?
- As a rural homeowner, I would not want noise from my home to be able to impact my neighbors. We are respectful of our neighbors.

- If we ever wanted to host a family wedding or party, our neighborhood is on such good terms, they would either be part of the event or know about what our plans were and it would be supported.

Environmental concerns:

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our community with reference to environmental issues during these events?
- While the Stop (work) Order was in place, the owners erected a permanent tent structure over the septic field, and I am told they have poured a cement pad on it too.
- Also, while the Stop (work) Order was in place and while events were being held, there was increased garbage noticed, including empty liquor bottles in ditches.. There is concern about how garbage would be dealt with and the timeliness of that if an rezoning is approved.
- The sewage system or water would not handle the volume of waste with a proposed 200+ person event. They have said they would take whatever measures needed to upgrade this, but again, they have proven untrustworthy to ensure this is adhered to going forward.
- County officials and bylaw were previously refused access to the property by the owners, so how can we be confident that they won't do that again? How can we be guaranteed environmental risks will it be monitored with the non compliant track record they have displayed eg. sewage/parking/water/garbage.
- Parking lot was developed with vehicle drainage directly adjacent to livestock and crops. What Agribusiness would take good agricultural soil, dump gravel on it and let weeds grow and overtake the lot? They have shown us they are not good agricultural stewards.
- Owners have been caught burying construction garbage.
- Before the owners dealt with their garbage, it blew all over the place. We had to pick up their garbage, from ditches and our own fields and property.

Waterline capacity/pressure and septic issues :

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our community with reference to water capacity/pressure and septic issues during these events?
- The owners have said they would take whatever measures needed to upgrade the water to service a 200 person Event Venue, but again, they have proven untrustworthy to ensure this would be adhered to going forward.
- Existing water supply/capacity issues with the Landing Trail Water Utility.
- Existing moratorium on new tie-ins for single family dwellings but the proposed Event Venue will host up to 200+ people.
- The proposed Event Venue is upstream of the majority of the residences tied to the Landing Trail Waterline. Therefore, more people could be negatively impacted by a venue of this magnitude, if these owners wanted to use the water.

Taxes and Property Values:

- Property tax impact with decrease in property values with residences located within proximity to a business operating an Events Venue.
- The property owners have not followed proper channels for approved development permits. If they had done so, adjacent property owners would have been advised before any development took place and would have had the opportunity to oppose this kind of development

Past Petition for a “Family” Event:

- Once in the past the owners of the Event Venue went to solicit names on a petition for a “family” event. The owners did not approach residents that were the closest to them, instead, they approached neighbours that were further away from them to sign a petition to host a large event. When asked by one neighbor what they were doing with the property, they tried to deceive them and said they were setting up a bed and breakfast. The neighbor confronted them and said they knew about their business website for an unauthorized Event Venue, and it was only then that they admitted to those plans..
-

On Aug 6, 2021, RCMP went to the property at midnight following a noise complaint and RCMP were told there were no owners on the property. RCMP spoke to a relative of the Bride or Groom and they said they felt misled by property owners. That doesn't sound right if it's a "family wedding"?

Illegal and unlicensed/unapproved Business activities:

- These owners have already proven they cannot be trusted with the countless infractions already, who will monitor them and protect our rights in the community with reference to unlicensed/unapproved business activities?
- Permits/county protocols not applied for or followed and further problems compounding if proper licensing permits not being obtained i.e. food and liquor. If the county is aware of this past behavior and risk, does it not increase liability for the County knowing the track record they hold for deception previously.
- The owners completed concrete work during the Stop Order and then rinsed the cement trucks off in our new home driveway without our permission.
- Fire and EMS plans/codes were not in place.... people witnessed smoking at the back of property in close proximity to agricultural fields, livestock and feed.
- Non-compliance to Stop (Work) Order.
- Owners continued with Special Events, referred to as "family" events, that the county says they could not stop. However, as evidenced by the August 6, 2021 event, RCMP confirmed it was not a family wedding. Also, a website indicated business operations and not personal events at the address, evidenced by theknot.com website and wildrose-banquet.business.site.
- How does the county expect to manage the misrepresentation with these events?

Harassment and Disrespect to neighbors and County:

- The Neighbours feel we are putting ourselves at risk by getting involved personally (especially if the event serves alcohol).
- The county needs to get more actively involved if further events are held. There is concern for safety based on the little respect displayed by the property owners for

county employees including bylaw, therefore, we feel there is an increased hostility risk by the Event Venue property owners.

- Neighbors have experienced issues with trespassing, property damage (field/fence/crops), disrespect, harassment and intimidation. County bylaw, a Councillor and County employees/elected officials have been treated with disrespect, and in one case threatened by the owners as witnessed by a neighbor. This is completely unacceptable!
- These owners appear to feel they are above the law. What would stop them from retaliating?
- As neighbors, we have been put in a terrible position.
- We worry that this is how they have operated without any approvals! What would happen if they get any type approval or power? What are we up against then?
- Video taped our property, enough so that workers building our house thought we should be warned about them recording and they felt very uncomfortable.
- Threatening altercations cause neighbors great stress, especially if we are the ones having to report and live with it!
- We had a vehicle from that property back into our driveway then spin out and spit rocks at us, while we were outside visiting with another neighbor.
- When we needed Bylaw officers to support us, the owners would not let them on the property. We had to resort to calling RCMP.
- The neighboring families do not trust anything they promise, as they have broken all the rules and completely disrespected our family and surrounding neighbors.
- A vehicle from the event venue backed into our driveway spun out and spit rocks at us and a neighbor that had stopped by.
- The owner of the event venue surrounded a vehicle in a threatening manner as

witnessed by a neighbor.

- Refuse to let bylaw on property during complaints. After all that we have witnessed, we would be concerned if one Bylaw officer was only on duty and they actually went onto the property for an infraction, due to previous behavior.
- No permits or inspections, worked through the night during stop order.
- Misrepresent themselves, in application, with saying they reside on the property. The house is VACANT.
- Poured cement and the cement truck rinsed residue in our private driveway without our permission. Their cement trucks also rinsed out along the county road;
- Said there were family weddings
- Operated a Business website advertising the property address for Event bookings.
- Our residence was being video recorded by someone from their property.
- The workers hired to build our home felt very uncomfortable and reported the recordings to us.
- We could not enjoy our own yard during these events (even heard from inside due to close proximity) because the noise was too loud, not only from music, but loud speaker announcements, honking of horns for traffic infractions and for wedding celebrations to name a few.

Thank you,
Launi Julio

From: [Dan Julio](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Please accept this letter for submission to the Public Hearing on Aug 22/23 at 1:30PM the proposed Bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 15, 2023 9:29:26 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

My name is Dan Julio, I am a county resident at 55013 Range Road 231 and I am directly impacted by the proposed Bylaw 1623/23 to redistrict 55010 Range Road 231 from AG-Agriculture to AG Agriculture 2 District for the purposes of an event venue and we are OPPOSED to the Bylaw for the following reasons:

Firstly, Thank you for hearing from me today.

I know this is redundant for most, but it is important to us that Mayor Alanna and Council hear this again as we are here once again, fighting for our rights against a neighbor who has had zero regard or respect for us or our agricultural way of life.

We oppose this redistricting bylaw for the following reasons:

- The new owners took possession, which included a residential home on the property and without permits or inspections converted and completed additions to make it an Event Venue.
- The County placed a Stop Order and the owners did not comply, instead worked in the middle of the night until conversions and additions were completed.
- Large, loud and disrespectful parties were held under the guise of “family” functions. They had a business website advertising this property for Event bookings. RCMP were called for noise complaints with each event, in one case, no owners were on the property for them to speak to and that the bridal party said they felt they had been deceived by the owners. This was clearly not a “family function” and it appeared they used it as a loophole for their business ventures..

- These large parties continued to negatively impact our privacy as well as the use, enjoyment and value of our residence and farming parcels which contravenes the County Bylaw for Event Venues.
- There were continuous complaints from neighbors and further enforcement involving a Court Order finally stopped events. However, before an agreement was made, we had to endure threats, harassment, trespassing and property damage.
- This experience has resulted in my family and the surrounding neighbors having absolutely NO relationship or trust with the applicants.
- The applicants have hired a consultant to assist them with their application and solicited feedback from neighbors for the owners. We chose not to reply to a third party based on history with the applicant. We wanted to be dealing directly with the County.
- The owners and their consultants indicate they will set up a neighbour complaint form. I have zero confidence based on factual events that they would do anything that isn't solely in their best interest as they have completely disrespected us and broken county procedures that the rest of us follow.
- Prior to this application, the owners never once approached us or any neighbors to discuss a compromise or even reduced noise levels. Calling the RCMP was the only way to have them comply, because the owners would not let Bylaw on the property.
- Through this application process the owners are now forced to follow the rules, but if approved, how long would their compliance last?
- These owners are not residents.
- This property is VACANT, and there has been no permanent resident living there since they took possession. They have told the County in the past that someone is living there, however, that is absolutely not the case. We live in such close proximity to the property, we know it is not occupied.
- So to be clear, these owners do not live in the property, but they want to have large

scale Parties, where WE live, 7 days a week.

- This property is vacant and disrepair has become apparent.
- This 4.62 acre lot is too small to support an Event Venue.
- It is in no way Agriculture related. .
- It is too close to residential farming families for it to not impact our enjoyment and quality of life and any noise mitigation with events is not going to work.
- These landowners do not contribute to the County or its residents, in fact what has been the cost of the resources The County has dedicated to mitigate this situation.
- Why would The County entertain approving a redistricting application for a business on such a small parcel of land with close proximity to family residences, with a non compliant owner with a proven track record like this?
- We, as a community have had to put up with being intimidated, threatened, harassed, trespassed and they have trampled on our agricultural way of life.
- These landowners have destroyed any relationship with us and other affected neighbors. They never once personally reached out to any of us to say, sorry we didn't approach this right. . Instead they have hired consultants to assist them in an attempt to succeed with their application. It has taken over two years and we still feel like we are at square one, waiting for the owners to selfishly do whatever they want anyway regardless of the County's decision.
- We would never willingly buy or build beside a venue like this and quite frankly I don't know anyone else who would either.
- In the owners application it suggests things like a "proposed tent structure for wedding ceremonies" however, that was already erected and used for ceremonies during the Stop Order/court order time frame. They erected a permanent tent structure, with cement, over the septic field. I wonder if they have compromised the septic field and what would the environmental impact be since they already hosted large events in the past...not to mention who would willingly want to say

their vows over a septic field.

- Furthermore, we worry the property has an abandoned look now. Weeds are overgrown in the parking lot that was built during the stop order, broken trees and weeds run the frontage of the property and two big broken lamp posts are lying in the driveway. Last year the grass went to seed and it was quite the feat to see them eventually try and cut it. An abandoned damaged culvert sits on display from an illegal approach they tried to put in. The snow buildup without any vehicle tracks is noticeable in winter.
- These owners can say whatever they want in their application and promise to make things right, but based on all that we have gone through, we would not trust anything they promise, as they have broken all the rules and completely disrespected our family and surrounding neighbors.
- We are afraid this will just become a dilapidated, abandoned property and a complete eyesore in our community, ultimately negatively impacting our property values.

This is a peaceful residential/agricultural area occupied by people who look out and care for one another, let's not let one person ruin this for so many others.

Thank you,
Dan Julio

From: [Ken Theroux](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#); [Martyn Bell](#)
Subject: Concerned residents of Sturgeon County directly impacted by the proposed bylaw and oppose the proposed bylaw.
Date: August 15, 2023 10:08:32 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

Dear Sturgeon County, Martyn Bell

We are concerned residents Ken and Michelle Theroux of Sturgeon County(55117 RR 231)who are directly impacted by the proposed bylaw and oppose the proposed bylaw. In reference to Bylaw 1623/23 Amendment to land use bylaw 1385/17- Redistricting of a portion of SE-55-23-W4M(55010 Range road 231) from AG- Agricultural district to AG2- Agriculture 2 district.

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing as a concerned resident of our community to express my strong opposition to the rezoning application for the proposed event venue. While I recognize the potential advantages such a venue could bring, I would like to share my apprehensions about the potential adverse effects on our serene and tight-knit community.

My primary concern centers on the anticipated surge in traffic that the event venue might introduce. Our community prides itself on its peaceful atmosphere and unhurried way of life. Introducing an event venue could potentially lead to a significant increase in visitors, resulting in traffic congestion, strain on local roads, and potential safety hazards. The existing road infrastructure might not be equipped to accommodate the influx of traffic associated with such an establishment, creating the potential for compromised road safety and a decline in the overall quality of life for our residents.

Furthermore, the potential escalation in vehicle speed due to the event venue is deeply disconcerting. With unfamiliar visitors navigating our area, there is a legitimate concern that some may exceed speed limits, disregarding the safety of pedestrians and residents. This poses a direct threat to the well-being and security of all community members, particularly our children and elderly residents.

Equally alarming is the strain the event venue could place on our utility infrastructure. Events necessitate substantial water, electricity, and sewage usage, and our existing systems may not be adequately equipped to handle the amplified demand. Insufficient utility provisions could result in service disruptions, significantly disrupting the daily routines of residents and local businesses.

The potential escalation of noise pollution is yet another aspect that deeply troubles me. Our community prides itself on its tranquility, and the introduction of events featuring amplified music and other sources of noise could gravely disturb this cherished serenity. This disruption threatens to impact the mental well-being of our residents and compromise the peaceful atmosphere that defines our way of life.

Moreover, the potential for intrusive bright lights stemming from the event venue is concerning. Our community deeply values the natural beauty of our surroundings, particularly during nighttime. The introduction of intense artificial lighting could mar our nocturnal environment and impede the ability to appreciate the night sky, affecting not only our residents but also the local wildlife.

Lastly, I am profoundly concerned about the potential for this rezoning application to set a concerning precedent. Granting approval for such an event venue could open the door to future developments that might be incongruent with the character of our community. Our community's unique identity is rooted in its tranquil and close-knit nature, and any precedent that departs from these values could lead to irreversible changes.

In conclusion, I implore you to earnestly contemplate the concerns I have outlined before reaching a decision regarding the rezoning application for the event venue. The potential negative impacts on traffic, safety, utilities, noise, and the overall character of our community are substantial and warrant thorough consideration.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Ken and Michelle Theroux

AUGUST 15, 2023

Rob Paradis
55112-Range Road 231, Sturgeon County, AB T8L 5B6

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

TO: Legislative Services - Sturgeon County

RE: Sturgeon Public Hearing Aug-22-23 - Proposed Bylaw Change Bylaw 1623-23

We are county residents and we are directly impacted by this proposed bylaw change, we are **Opposed** to this proposed change that could allow the property at 55010 Range Road 231 to be granted a change from "AG – Agriculture" to "AG2 – Agricultural 2 District" for the purpose of developing an event venue.

This property, when occupied by the previous owner, was immaculately maintained, and the owners were friends and neighbors in our community. Since the new owners have purchased the property, there has not been anyone living there. The current owners have tried to change this acreage into a commercial event venue, to our knowledge without obtaining proper permits for these activities from Sturgeon County, nor did they obtain several permits for the changes and renovations made to the property. There are 15 residences that share this 2 mile stretch of road on Range Road 231 from Highway 37 to Township Road 552, an event or wedding venue would not provide any benefit to our community, rather there are many concerns regarding this type of use for a property in our area.

The current owners of this acreage did hold some events, to our knowledge without proper permits or proper zoning in place. The events had many people, the events lasted for more than 1 day, there were many vehicles coming and going, increased traffic at an already dangerous intersection on Highway 37 and Range Road 231 was noticeable. A rather temporary parking lot was constructed last minute to handle the first wedding event, a second access driveway to the property added, the culvert that was installed was not properly sized, the access and culvert had to be removed later. There have been many changes and conversions of the residence to provide use to accommodate large events, cooking facilities were added, an extension to the garage area with new washrooms was added, an outdoor shelter was added, to our knowledge permits with Sturgeon were not in place for these changes. The former occupant of the property pointed out that the outdoor shelter for event participants has been constructed overtop the septic field for the property! With the mismanagement of this property to date by the current owners and hidden agenda for its use, we do not trust the current owners for any future plans or promises they make to Sturgeon County or there neighboring residents.

In closing I do not find any benefit to having an event facility operational at 55010 Range Road 231, rather it will only negatively impact our community. We are not opposed to having an event venue in Sturgeon County, but it needs to be situated in a town, or commercial use area, or segregated in an isolated area of Sturgeon where there would not be negative impact to other residents in the area.

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

From: [C & J Gaumont](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: Public Hearing-Bylaw 1623/23
Date: August 15, 2023 3:03:07 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

With regard to the above proposal we are very concerned of the disruption an event venue of this size will cause. As this will be a business, we would assume the organizers will want to book often to make it viable. Two hundred extra people arriving on a regular basis does not provide a quiet, comfortable lifestyle for the surrounding residents on RR231. As we witnessed previously, cars were parked on RR231, shuttle buses were in drive-ways. We do not believe the noise level will not increase, this is not

Possible with 200 people, vehicles and music.

We also question if RR231 can handle this traffic? As we all know keeping up with rural road repair is timely and very expensive.

Being an adjacent land owner we are highly concerned in regards to the resale of our property. People who are looking to buy in the country in a quiet setting would not entertain the idea to purchase next to a wedding event venue.

We are opposed to the proposed bylaw.

Conrad and JoAnn Gaumont

Land owners: 2-55-23-W4

Sent from my iPad

AUGUST 15, 2023

Marsha Paradis

55112-Range Road 231, Sturgeon County, AB T8L 5B6

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act

TO: Legislative Services - Sturgeon County

RE: Sturgeon Public Hearing Aug-22-23 - Proposed Bylaw Change Bylaw 1623-23

My name is Marsha Paradis. I live one mile north of the property at 55010 Range Road 231 which is the property being addressed at this hearing. My husband and I, as well as the many neighbours on Range Road 231 are directly impacted by this proposed bylaw change. Let me clearly state that I am OPPOSED to this proposed change that could allow this property to be granted a change from "AG – Agriculture" to "AG2 – Agricultural 2 District" for the purpose of developing an event venue.

Our neighborhood community has been concerned with the unfolding issues of Mr. Lail's commercial event and wedding business for over 2 years now.

Mr. Lail bought the acreage at the south end of range road 231. We are a welcoming community and we looked forward to meeting our new neighbours. Interestingly, no one moved in to the residence to live; nor has anyone resided there since it was bought. Before long, we noticed a great deal of construction; archways over the driveway, new windows and doors installed where the garage used to be, a new approach and culvert south of the main driveway, trees being cleared where a parking lot was formed, a large tent appeared overtop of the septic field area, and there were now other small structures like pagodas and swings. When I spoke with Mr. Lail he said that he was he was making changes on the property to host family events there.

In time, Mr. Lail started to host weddings and events. We had not been notified by Sturgeon about the possibility of a large event place running a business on our road. The reason for this was that Mr. Lail had never obtained any permits for any of the changes, so Sturgeon County was also unaware of this happening.

During that summer Mr. Lail's business hosted weddings lasting 2-4 days, late into the evenings with loud music that was very disruptive to neighbours as well as making it difficult for small children to sleep. The increased traffic turning off an already busy hi-way was of grave concern. There was trespassing by patrons into the neighbour's cattle pasture and field. The increased use of the The Landing Trail Water System caused neighbours to the north to have decreased volume of water.

Clearly several unacceptable conditions began to arise in our community and Sturgeon County then became aware that a wedding venue was operating without permits due to complaints from those who lived close by. We then realized that Mr. Lail was running a wedding and banquet business advertised as Wild Rose Banquet. Because of the increased noise, trespassing and lack of permits, a Stop Order was issued to Mr. Lail, even so there were times events went ahead anyways. Peace officers, RCMP, Sturgeon council members, Sturgeon's CAO, and Sturgeon's Manager of Planning and Development became involved. Conversations between Mr. Lail and neighbours sometimes became heated.

With Sturgeon's new agricultural 2 zoning, an application has been made by Mr. Lail's business, that could allow the property at 55010 Range Road 231 to be granted a change from "AG – Agriculture" to - Agricultural 2 District" for the purpose of developing an event venue for weddings and other multi-person events.

Indeed, Mr. Lail has proposed many changes, including monitoring of noise level, noting hours of operation, upgrading of the water system, upgrades to the septic tank and field system, and involving Alberta Transportation in regards to turning off hi way 37.

I see two main problems here. The first is that this is already a very populated and established road where folks have settled into what was thought a peaceful spot in Sturgeon to enjoy country life. This is NO PLACE for a busy event venue. This venue shares property lines with residents to the north and directly across from two other families. Several other homes are north of this venue. We are affected in numerous ways as have already been stated. I must say the increased traffic and noise is a HUGE concern for well being and safety. I'm not comfortable with last call being 12:30 am for events and then having folks driving home. I'm concerned about our safety and safety of patrons. Will there be increased patrolling by peace officers? If so, at who's expense?

My second great concern is that Mr. Lail's history in dealing with neighbours and Sturgeon County has been one of disrespect and dishonesty, often doing as he pleases without abiding by the Stop Order, listening to the needs of neighbours or trying to work cooperatively. I have little faith that this will change. His venue greatly impacts our community and belongs in an Ag 2 area that does not negatively impact its already established neighbours.

AUGUST 15, 2023

Kaitlin Eystone
55102-Range Road 231, Sturgeon County, AB T8L 5B6

TO: Legislative Services - Sturgeon County

RE: **Sturgeon Public Hearing Aug-22-23 - Proposed Bylaw Change Bylaw 1623-23**

We reside in Sturgeon County and we are directly impacted by this proposed bylaw change. We are **Opposed** to this proposed change that could allow the property at 55010 Range Road 231 to be granted a change from "AG – Agriculture" to "AG2 – Agricultural 2 District" for the purpose of developing an event venue.

The people who have taken over the property of 55010 Range Road 231 are trying to convert a residential property into a wedding/event space. Previously it was a lovely, quiet home with a family who cared about our community. Now it has turned into a property that has caused much distress amongst the community and our neighborhood members have had to use countless hours of our precious personal lives to combat an unwanted event venue. Many of us do not support this event venue and there has been issues with the entire process starting with the fact that we were never given any option in the matter; they never applied for permits from the beginning.

The neighborhood community does not support this business as we purchased/developed our homes to be in quite, secluded areas to enjoy. Mr Lail held a few events last year and they were quite disruptive to the neighborhood. There was an overwhelming amount of traffic; lots of traffic coming from the highways with a disregard to speed limits. There are many of us who have children on this road and traffic is one of my biggest concerns. Our road is also not designed for high volume of traffic, we already have road condition issues and we definitely don't need more vehicles contributing to those issues. Parking is also an issue. If they intend to have up to 90 vehicles there is not enough room in their small parking lot accommodate all the vehicles that would attend. It is a concern that they would then be parking on the side of the road. Also it has been mentioned that the trees that surround the parking lot provide a visual barrier which is untrue. From our Range Road there are no trees that provide a visual barrier. The noise level that was produced during the events were also unsettling. We neighbors have a right to have quiet evenings in the country and not have to be subjected to loud, disruptive music/sounds. Also because the property was never designed to be an event venue the water consumption is also a concern. I built my home 10 years ago and I was not allowed to connect to the water line because it was at capacity. Mr. Lail intends to upgrade the waterline system but I am still waiting for this option so I cannot foresee this happening right away and therefore their consumption would impact other neighbors that are on the waterline system. Mr. Lail has also had a disregard for the law. Bylaw officers & RCMP have had to converse with him on numerous occasions. There was even a stop order put into effect which they ignored on several occasions as well. I do not feel he should have the right to move forward with the event venue as he has shown that he is not willing to follow the rules that are put in place.

We deserve to live in our community without an event venue. Please do not grant a change from "AG – Agriculture" to "AG2 – Agricultural 2 District". We do not want an event venue on our quiet, community focused range road.

WATRIN GRAIN LTD



August 14, 2023

Subject: Bylaw 1623/23 to redistrict 55010 Range Road 231 from “AG- Agriculture to AG@ Agriculture 2 District “for the purposes of an event venue”

Dear Sturgeon County Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Bylaw 1623/23, which aims to redistrict the property at 55010 Range Road 231 from "AG- Agriculture" to "AG@ Agriculture 2 District" for the purpose of an event venue. My name is Lee Watrin, and I have been a resident and farmer in this area for over 30 years. As a long-standing member of the community and a directly affected individual, I feel compelled to voice my concerns regarding this bylaw.

Water Line Capacity, Grey Water & Sewer Waste

One of the most pressing issues with this proposed venue is the potential strain it will put on local infrastructure. It is crucial to consider the effect such a venue will have on an already at capacity waterline. Regularly hosting events for up to 200 people will also undoubtedly result in a significant amount of grey water and sewage production. Given that the property was originally designed as a residential property, it is questionable whether its existing infrastructure can adequately handle the water requirement and waste

WATRIN GRAIN LTD



generated by such gatherings. This could lead to environmental concerns and potential health hazards.

Garbage and Environmental Impact

Already, there have been instances of excessive garbage accumulating in nearby areas, including ditches, roads, and fields. This not only poses a threat to the natural environment but also adversely affects the visual appeal of our community. Allowing this venue to continue operating without addressing the issue of proper waste management will only exacerbate this problem and negatively impact the area's aesthetics and ecological balance.

Trespassing & Crop Damage:

The trespassing issues on my own crops, which have resulted in the need to involve law enforcement, are directly linked to the events taking place at this property. With the proposed bylaw in place, hosting regular four-day wedding events for 200 people would likely lead to a significant increase in trespassing incidents. The cumulative effect of numerous occurrences would undoubtedly cause considerable damage to my crops and result in substantial financial losses. This cannot be allowed to continue.

Property Value & Quality of Life:

The potential impact of noise pollution, increased traffic, and the overall disruption caused by the continuous operation of this venue should not be underestimated. Property values in the surrounding area are at risk of decline due to these negative influences. The serene and peaceful nature of our community would be compromised, and homeowners could suffer financial losses as a result.

WATRIN GRAIN LTD



Infrastructure and Safety Concerns:

The existing infrastructure, including roads, was not designed to accommodate the high traffic that a venue of this nature would attract. The strain on the roads and the additional maintenance required could lead to further degradation of an already poorly maintained road system. Additionally, there are legitimate concerns about fire safety, particularly given the absence of nearby fire hydrants in case of emergencies.

Long-Term Plans and Accountability:

The lack of a clear long-term plan for the venue's operation raises significant concerns. Who will be responsible for maintaining the property, addressing road conditions, and preventing trespassing? The burden of these responsibilities could potentially fall on the shoulders of taxpayers, which is an unjust distribution of costs.

Alternative Location and Compatibility:

It's my firm belief that a venue of this nature would be better suited for a location along a major highway with proper infrastructure and traffic control measures. Such a location would mitigate noise pollution and minimize disturbances to local residents. The infrastructure and facilities at such a site would also be better equipped to handle the demands of hosting events for a large number of people.

Personal Experience with Property Owners:

I would like to bring attention to the behavior and maintenance of the property owner's personal residence at 2708 Valor Avenue NW in Edmonton. Since he has taken

WATRIN GRAIN LTD



possession of this property, we have seen a significant change in the yard. It is not well maintained. There are multiple vehicles in disrepair and garbage throughout the yard that often blows into the neighboring yard to the west. The apparent lack of maintenance and upkeep raises valid concerns about the individual's commitment to maintaining the proposed event venue in question.

In conclusion, I strongly oppose Bylaw 1623/23 and urge you to deny any applications to operate the proposed event venue at its current location. The potential negative impacts on the environment, quality of life, property values, and the livelihoods of local farmers are too significant to overlook. Instead, I advocate for the establishment of such venues in locations that are better equipped to handle the demands and potential consequences associated with large-scale events.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I trust that you will make a decision that prioritizes the well-being and interests of the community.

Sincerely,

Lee & Colette Watrin

Watrin Grain Ltd.

Severed in line with section 17 of the FOIP Act