The draft definition of Agritourism aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Agree

31 responses

Strongly Agree

4 responses

Disagree

2 responses

Strongly Disagree

2 responses

The draft core criteria (including applicable parcels and activities) of Agritourism aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Disagree

14 responses

Agree

12 responses

Strongly Disagree

11 responses

Strongly Agree

2 responses

Comments:

I have no problem with the activities mentioned but I strongly believe all land owners near by should be allowed to have a say at the time of application, no matter the land size of proposed activity. It is only fair for those living close to a proposed site to have a say. Consideration needs to be given on size, noise, garbage disposal, parking and traffic increase. If it is a one time deal, that is doable, but all summer long can get very annoying and frustrating. I live 1/2 mile from the stratotec race track on SH 825. I have no idea how that application was approved but the noise from there every night and all weekend long, every summer, is horrible. As a land owner I cannot enjoy being outside on my own property and my animals are stressed and suffering from the constant noise pollution. I definitely would have wanted a say in that proposal had anyone asked.

1 response

Adjacent or affected landowners should ALWAYS have the opportunity to speak to such applications. This is particularly so as the definition of agritourism is so broad. Making this a permitted use and removing any right of appeal (subject of course to an appeal to Queen's Bench or the Court of Appeal under the MGA) does not address the last guiding principal with respect to other landowners' interests and their rights to peaceful enjoyment and use of their property. See, for example, "Pumpkin Canons". See also for example dog agility competition leading to dozens of RVs parked on neighboring property. Significant concerns, depending on what agritourism is proposed, including already poor roads made worse by excessive traffic, in addition to waste/sewage generated and water use.

1 response

You should not be able to take current land designations and now say those designations are able to do functions beyond what was previously defined, and say that neighbours would have no opportunity to appeal any permitted use approved. Additionally, anything that involves a fee over and above the cost to sell an agriculture product (example selling a vegetable at a reasonable cost only) should not be allowed. This all moves into the territory of a business, and we need to address permits and requirements as such. No resident would want to live next door to a business! This is farmland, and we are rural. Consideration needs to be made for how close neighbouring farms are located, as well roads, access, etc.

1 response

We think that no matter what the land size, neighbours should always have the ability to appeal or at least make their objections/concerns knows. We spend a lot of money when we buy our properties and should always be able to voice our concerns to council if there is something that will affect our enjoyment of our own property.

1 response

I feel a larger parcel of land should still have the consideration of neighboring properties, because even though it may stop smaller residential acreages from hosting events, the same type of problems can arise from a larger parcel of land too. We live in the communities and are often the eyes and ears of the community.

1 response

Neighbors should be able to appeal something like a corn maze or pumpkin patch if it means crowds of people could potentially be wandering around beside your house. And traffic could be heavy on the road going by your house. No matter what the business, neighbors should be allowed to have a say if it could impact them.

1 response

I believe that there should be an emphasis on education. An opportunity to educate people about how food is produced and harvested. Ideally there would be licensed farming operations throughout the county set up to allow visitors to participate in the life cycle of producing the farm products.

1 response

I have just moved out of the city to the country to enjoy the peace and quiet. I would not be very supportive of any businesses nearby that would have an increase of cars constantly driving past my home (where I'm raising 4 young boys) or any noise happening potentially late into the evening.

1 response

I don't agree that AG major and minor don't have to notify neighbors. I would expect a appeal process in place for both as well. A neighbour Finding out after permits have been approved is in acceptable. Have a notification and appeal process for AG Major and minor as well

1 response

I like the idea of those that are interested in expanding their source of income or experiences to have the opportunity to do so. I do not feel that I am in an area that would be affected by the changes that are set forth, so I feel that my input is based on this fact.

1 response

I don't agree that neighbors do not have the opportunity to appeal that decision on AG-Major (16 ha or larger in size), and • AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha). County currently has poor gravel road conditions, how can they possibly handle the extra traffic load.

We agree with the criteria for Agritourism. It is important that hours of operation are limited and that the activities do not disturb neighbours or their livestock. Setbacks from neighbouring properties should be considered.

1 response

The scale of the activity is different from a B&B to a Corn Maze and Trail Rides; AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha) may not be large enough and neighbors should have input

1 response

Residents in this quiet and peaceful area should not be negatively affected by noise pollution produced by agritourism, regardless of size of land parcel.

1 response

I think AG Minor is inappropriate for some tourism ie; Corn maze or other activities with high participation. Other activities it is appropriate ie; B+B

1 response

disagree with neighbours notbeing told of zoning changes/consultation. as well when zoned for agri tourism approriate tax must be paid ie comercial.

I wonder if an appeal process should be implemented. Neighbors won't necessarily understand the impact of new business until the business is open.

1 response

With any event or business being run near neighbours, neighbours SHOULD have a say on if they want that happening near by or not

1 response

Why do large land owners by-pass input from the neighbors? I suspect the larger events may have more impact on them

1 response

I dont agree neighbours of AG Major and AG Minor not being notified and have opportunities to appeal.

1 response

AG Minor is not always appropriate for some tourism activities, considering traffic and noise.

1 response

More transparency of this process and a clearer definition of Agritourism is required

1 response

All development should be notifying neighbors regardless of the property size.

1 response

I am not happy about Neighbors being unable to appeal on some of the Permits.

1 response

How come neighbor land owners have no opportunity to appeal?

1 response

Neighbors should have a voice in all situations

1 response

AG-minor should be corrected to be 4-15.9 ha

Should always be a chance to appeal

1 response

The draft definition of Agritourism Event aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Agree

25 responses

Disagree

5 responses

Strongly Disagree

5 responses

Strongly Agree

4 responses

The draft core criteria (including applicable parcels and activities) of Agritourism Event aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Disagree

15 responses

Strongly Disagree

15 responses

Agree

5 responses

Strongly Agree

4 responses

Dear Task Force: We have many concerns with this category. We strongly disagree. We do not see Wedding Venues as Agritourism. We realize that Covid has encouraged many outdoor Venues but a Wedding or Reunion as a Commercial Activity is too invasive for close neighbours and property owners. Since we have a proposed Venue (owned by brother Mark and sister in law Kimberly Boddez) beside our property we will list all of our concerns. We would have liked to have participated online but our internet connection is not reliable, and we would need more than five minutes. A longer time should have been considered for residents who border proposed Venues, as we feel that it affects us more than those who do not border proposed Venues, and are a greater distance away. First-The Venue is immediately beside our land by the fence dividing our property and the proposed Wedding Venue property. We pasture our 6 horses right by this fence. The Proposed Venue is too close to our property (it already exists as a Wedding Photography/Wedding Ceremony Venue). It is simply too close to our property and animals. The close proximity would encourage guest interaction with our horses by party goers if allowed to be a Wedding Venue. Horses can be activated to run and possibly run through the fence, and people under the influence can have strange ideas after drinking and having fun late at night. eg. Jumping on one of the horses. The Venue would be too close to our horses. Too Close to Bush- The Venue is too close to our bush/trees. Our property has a creek (mostly dry or very low in summer) and treed area all along this property line that separates the Existing Wedding Venue from our property. We are greatly concerned about potential fires from cigarette butts, etc. There is not a sufficient means to control a massive bush fire along the bush line right beside the Venue and our Property. Our home is close to this bush/trees and would likely burn if a fire started along the bush, at this Venue. Value Impact- A Venue with 150 + guests and a 1:00am close and 24 hour time allowance would impact the value of our property. Both the acreage with the house as well as the rest of the 74 or so acres. Potential buyers (if we were to sell) will want a price reduction as no one wants a Wedding Venue that can be heard every Summer weekend, late into the night. And neither do we. Event Limit-The limit of 10 Events and 150 guests cannot be monitored. There is every opportunity for Venue owners to proceed with more Events and more guests as time goes on since no one from the County is really attending and monitoring the Events. Unlike a Rented Hall, rules are at the discretion of the Event Owners and for the Event Owners Revenue, not the Community for Community Revenue. Venue Owners can stretch the rules. Or in the future, Venue owners could request the County to allow a number increase, or later hours. If the bylaw was changed, there would also be little or no resistance because the Bylaws cannot be opposed according to your proposed definitions. This is not fair to adjacent landowners. And changes would be easy to implement since it is already accepted as. a bylaw. Insurance- At present, the Venue beside us is advertising that Venue Renters must purchase insurance for their rented event. The Insurance by the Venue Owner does not cover Adjacent property owners if their guests were to cause damage to Adjacent landowner property. We would be fighting Insurance companies as to who is responsible for any damages. OUR OBJECTIONS: *Too close to our house and land *Too close to property line and 6 horses where they pasture *Too close to Bush and trees for Runaway Fires. *Too noisy-we can see and hear Venue that is there already *Too late-1:00 am & partiers after Event is too late (24 hour, possible campers & after party) We cannot understand how this should be allowed near adjacent properties! *Devalue Property-no one wants a late night, large venue close to home and property *Impact to our enjoyment of our land and property *Too much traffic late at night *Too much traffic, to and from, causing Dust. *Late night lights from Cars if parked near property line *24 hour Event would allow camping, late parties and unsupervised late into night *Not controlled by County *Too easy for Bylaws (number of guests and hours) to be stretched or expanded in future *No ability for adjacent landowners to oppose when proposed, problematic or expanded. *We do not want to have to babysit our property when Events are taking place. We have watched the Venue owners operate as a Wedding/Photography and Wedding Ceremony Venue next door to us for the last year. To our understanding with the County, no permit was granted. We were OK with the small scale of the Wedding Ceremony/Photography Venue and since Covid restricted the number of guests, the Events were small and did not affect our enjoyment of our property. However, the new proposed definitions of Agritourism Event would impact us greatly. As only one, extremely affected landowner couple we wonder if anyone else in the County would want a Venue next to them if their situation was exactly the same as us. This new definition of Agritourism Event will definitely be controversial with more landowners than ourselves. If more people were to apply for Wedding Venues in the future with adjacent landowners such as ourselves, we will see more people who are vehemently opposing these Venues. I am considering a situation the same or similar to ours. At present, you are asking for the opinion of just a few who will be affected when the bylaw is passed. Not everyone's opinion should be considered with the same weight as some are affected much more than others. With the exception of a few of you who are already operating a Wedding Venue, or are in favour of large impositions to landowners, you can expect that any landowner with a Venue that affects them as it does us, will oppose it. We have expressed our views to the County when we first discovered the possibility of a Wedding Venue next to us. We cannot see any of our concerns addressed in the proposed guidelines thus far. We hope that we have strongly expressed our concerns and disapproval of the Wedding Venue beside our property. We are also available to discuss any of our concerns or answer questions you may have. We will also forward our concerns to the Mayor and Councillors. Sincerely,

Redacted

1) The event owners are not all agricultural business owners. So how does this provide any solutions for individuals that own a smaller than 4 ha parcel of land that wish to operate an event facility. 2) Property owners of less than 4 ha should be given the opportunity to at least apply for discretionary use. 3) Permanent facilities would be the best way to mitigate noise to adjacent land owners. So why deny property owners the ability to build a facility? This would allow the venue owners to operate their business while also ensuring the least impact to adjacent land owners. 4) There are cultures that have weddings that are longer than 24 hours. Does that mean the county will not allow these cultures to have weddings within its community? 5) Do you have be a registered owner of the property to hold events? Something that should be considered. 6) What if a building is already constructed on a property? Will the events be subject to fire codes? Will an agricultural based business be subject to Commercial building standards and inspections to deem a pre existing facility safe to hold an event? (By allowing an agricultural business the ability to build a facility could eliminate the risk associated to having an event being held in an unsafe structure) 7) 10 events per year is not a sufficient amount of events for someone whose sole income is based on this business. 10 events barely covers the costs associated with such events. If all other requirements are met (i.e. sound mitigation, hours, parking etc.) why limit the amount of events that can be held? 8) Maybe there needs to be a Rec-Event zoning considered in addition to this Agritourism-Event for those properties and owners that do not fall under Ag-Minor/Ag-Major.

---

1 response

You should not be able to take current land designations and now say those designations are able to do functions beyond what was previously defined, and say that neighbours would have no opportunity to appeal any permitted use approved. Additionally, anything that involves a fee over and above the cost to sell an agriculture product (example selling a vegetable at a reasonable cost only) should not be allowed. This all moves into the territory of a business, and we need to address permits and requirements as such. No resident would want to live next door to a business! This is farmland, and we are rural. Consideration needs to be made for how close neighbouring farms are located, as well roads, access, etc. Additionally, who would monitor these events to ensure they do not exceed the approved criteria? Does this mean the county is going to incur additional costs of now having to have staff attend each event to ensure it does not exceed the criteria? What would be the consequences if it did? Again, I would not want to be expected to live next door to an event of up to 150 people lasting until 1 am up to 10 times a year!

Adjacent or affected landowners should ALWAYS have the opportunity to speak to such applications. This is particularly so as the definition of agritourism is so broad. Making this a permitted use and removing any right of appeal (subject of course to an appeal to Queen's Bench or the Court of Appeal under the MGA) does not address the last guiding principal with respect to other landowners' interests and their rights to peaceful enjoyment and use of their property. See, for example, "Pumpkin Canons". See also for example dog agility competition leading to dozens of RVs parked on neighboring property. Significant concerns, depending on what agritourism is proposed, including already poor roads made worse by excessive traffic, in addition to waste/sewage generated and water use.

1 response

I am very happy to see all the work the task force has done so far, however rationale on some of the decisions would be appreciated for further education on providing feedback and input into these considerations. I have been reading the minutes that were recently added to the web page and can't determine the approach or discussion surrounding certain aspects of this document. Under the current definitions my current operating business would be severely impacted so I would like the opportunity to provide feedback and participate in discussions to ensure a suitable outcome can occur to protect current operating businesses that would fall under Agritourism, as well as ensure future developements operate under proper guidelines and best practices.

1 response

neighbours should be able to appeal an AG-Minor permit, especially if you have 150 people in a 4-5 ha parcel. The draft restrictions are prescriptive enough that they should be included in the core criteria. The lack of permanent structures, limited hour duration, and limited number of events will stymie and may even prohibit capital investment. A 48 hour event may be more appropriate for corporate team building endeavours to meet the aim of corporate team building.

1 response

Again, we think that no matter what the land size, neighbours should always have the ability to appeal or at least make their objections/concerns knows. We spend a lot of money when we buy our properties and should always be able to voice our concerns to council if there is something that will affect our enjoyment of our own property. Very pleased to see that you are ensuring that the land size for events like this are 4 ha. or more.

1 response

I think 10 events per year at a non-permanent facility is too many and may prove to be an undo burden to neighbours. Considering non-permanent likely means a tent which then means the summer timeframe, an operator could set up a tent for 10 weeks over summer and host a wedding or party every weekend. What neighbour wants to hear that every weekend of the best outdoor time of the year?

1 response

Residence affected by the agritourism event should be consulted and have the right to oppose the occurrence of the event. With the given criteria, it is possible that a resident would have to listen to noise pollution for 10 consecutive weekends (Mid June to end of August) from the agritourism events. Our quiet subdivision would not be a peaceful place to live.

1 response

Neighbors should be allowed to have input into whether these events can take place so that lives are not impacted. Once a year might not be so bad but 10 times a year could be annoying if it was every Saturday in the summer and you end up having loud music playing while you are trying to have a family barbecue

1 response

As mentioned I as a landowner want a say in what comes into my area. I have lived and farmed this land for 65 years. I deserve a say. I have no problem for short term use for Agritourism but when it affects my way of live and my enjoyment of my land, I deserve a say. My taxes alone should guarantee that .

1 response

No weddings should be held on properties smaller than 4 ha. There is so much to consider when you are putting a wedding venue near neighbours and one that needs to carefully be considered and discussed with neighbours and neighbours are the number one concern in this particular matter

I don't agree that AG major and minor don't have to notify neighbors. I would expect a appeal process in place for both as well. A neighbour Finding out after permits have been approved is in acceptable. Have a notification and appeal process for AG Major and minor as well

1 response

I don't agree that neighbors do not have the opportunity to appeal that decision on AG-Major (16 ha or larger in size), and • AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha). County currently has poor gravel road conditions, how can they possibly handle the extra traffic load.

1 response

The hours for the weekend do not take into consideration people that work on the weekend usually starting between 3-6 am, we feel it is unfair to allow this type of business so close to neighbors, as it has happened several times with out a permit in the past.

1 response

All development should be notifying neighbors regardless of the property size. This process is very confusing to understand from the viewpoint of someone new looking at it. Might be simple to those that have been working on this for months/years

1 response

If I was a neighbor to a parcel where way they were hosting 10 weddings a year of 150 people, this would be too much, and if I as a neighbor am not given a voice in this decision then this is unfair to a tax payer in Sturgeon County

Weddings, reunions, ect. should be permitted on smaller parcels of land with attendance cap adjusted to land size. There should be no limit to the number of events. Hours of operation Friday and Saturday until 2am.

1 response

AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha) is potentially not large enough for weddings, as sound is difficult to contain and easily affects surrounding properties. Traffic can also be an intense issue.

1 response

I am not sure the limitations are right. Country weddings for example are known for large gatherings also why limit to 10 times per year. As an opportunity for tourism why the limitations?

1 response

who is going to enforce the 150 guests rule? as well the hours of operation are unreasonable sun to sat 8 til 6 thats it. and 24 hours for an event is out to lunch/unreasonable as well

1 response

An AG Minor is not leave an appropriate buffer for neighbors as these are loud and traffic intense events. (i have additional comments on a lived experience I will submit)

1 response

AG Minor does not leave an appropriate buffer for neighbours, considering noise and traffic.(Additional comments on a lived experience we are submitting)

I dont agree neighbours of AG Major and AG Minor not being notified and have opportunities to appeal.

1 response

More transparency and a clearer definition of AgriTourism Event is required

1 response

Similar issues can exist with a large parcel as with a smaller parcel.

1 response

How come adjacent land owners can't appeal?

The draft definition of Diversified Agribusiness aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Agree

28 responses

Strongly Agree

6 responses

Disagree

4 responses

Strongly Disagree

1 response

The draft core criteria (including applicable parcels and activities) of Diversified Agribusiness aligns with the Guiding Principles.

View options

Disagree

14 responses

Agree

13 responses

Strongly Disagree

9 responses

Strongly Agree

3 responses

You should not be able to take current land designations and now say those designations are able to do functions beyond what was previously defined, and say that neighbours would have no opportunity to appeal any permitted use approved. Additionally, anything that involves a fee over and above the cost to sell an agriculture product (example selling a vegetable at a reasonable cost only) should not be allowed. This all moves into the territory of a business, and we need to address permits and requirements as such. No resident would want to live next door to a business! This is farmland, and we are rural. Consideration needs to be made for how close neighbouring farms are located, as well roads, access, etc. Diversified Agribusiness is a business, and should be considered as such. This should not be allowed under AG-Agriculture District zoning.

1 response

Adjacent or affected landowners should ALWAYS have the opportunity to speak to such applications. This is particularly so as the definition of agribusiness is so broad. Making this a permitted use and removing any right of appeal (subject of course to an appeal to Queen's Bench or the Court of Appeal under the MGA) does not address the last guiding principal with respect to other landowners' interests and their rights to peaceful enjoyment and use of their property. See, for example, "Pumpkin Canons". See also for example dog agility competition leading to dozens of RVs parked on neighboring property. Significant concerns, depending on what agritourism is proposed, including already poor roads made worse by excessive traffic, in addition to waste/sewage generated and water use.

1 response

Again I have no issue with the above proposals. But if I am not consulted, how do I know what type of activity is proposed and how it may affect my way of life. Farmers were here first and have built this area into a marketable environment. We deserve a say before any activity takes over. That is how you get cooperation from all parties. I again use the race track as my example. Initially application apparently was just for go carts and then it evolved in bigger cars and motorcycles, screeching tires and racing engines every night and on weekends. Hopefully that application will never again be approved. I was not consulted by anyone as to whether I would want that in my back yard. Had I been the answer would definitely have been a strong NO.

We agree with some of these definitions for diversified Agribusiness.We agree with regular hours of operation of the Activities, the lack of imposition on neighbours and the smaller impact on traffic and neighbours. If there is a larger impact on neighbours, then they should be allowed to oppose it. The definition does not give enough details as to what all is included in this category. We would have preferred to mark off a "not sure" reaction to this category.

1 response

Community gardens, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) and other examples you mention should be very feasible on a AG-Residential without neighbour approval-appeal as long as the property is larger than 2 ha. Alternatively, it may be more appropriate that AG-Residential applicants can only be appealed if the neighbour is within 200m of the permit site.

1 response

Any businesses within a certain distance of a neighbor's dwelling should only be approved if it does not impact the privacy and enjoyment of the neighbors. We have always had the opportunity to be consulted on these permits and this must not change. It's not fair for the landowner to improve the value of their land at the expense of the neighbors.

1 response

We think that no matter what the land size, neighbours should always have the ability to appeal or at least make their objections/concerns knows. We spend a lot of money when we buy our properties and should always be able to voice our concerns to council if there is something that will affect our enjoyment of our own property.

I don't agree that AG major and minor don't have to notify neighbors. I would expect a appeal process in place for both as well. A neighbour Finding out after permits have been approved is in acceptable. Have a notification and appeal process for AG Major and minor as well

1 response

I don't agree that neighbors do not have the opportunity to appeal that decision on AG-Major (16 ha or larger in size), and • AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha). County currently has poor gravel road conditions, how can they possibly handle the extra traffic load.

1 response

All development should be notifying neighbors regardless of the property size. This process is very confusing to understand from the viewpoint of someone new looking at it. Might be simple to those that have been working on this for months/years

1 response

as long as long late night hours are not allowed with these businesses they would be no problem, and as long as modern Distillery practices are followed, and the actual building be built with consideration to the surrounding land owners.

1 response

AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha) could be too small for some activities with a high volume of people, traffic and product. Neighbours should have an opportunity to appeal the potential issuance of a permit.

I am not certain why neighbors wouldn't be involved in a potential appeal. We are imbedded in the community and may have information to contribute that may be beneficial to a decision.

1 response

again no consultation with adjacent landowners is wrong as well charging admission is a buisness appropriate taxation ie comercial is expected

1 response

Consideration of traffic and assembly needs to be considered for large events like farmers markets. Not all are suitable for AG Minor.

1 response

Traffic and assembly must be considered for large events, like farmers markets. Not all activities are suitable for AG Minor.

1 response

I dont agree neighbours of AG Major and AG Minor not being notified and have opportunities to appeal.

1 response

More transparency and a clearer definition of Diversified AgriBusiness is required

1 response

I disagree with the large land owners by passing neighbour approvals

1 response

No restrictions on activities, times, number of people/visitors etc?

1 response

How come adjacent landowners can't appeal?

1 response

Also should consider meat processing

1 response

Overall, thinking about the three draft definitions and proposed core criteria, I would:

View options

Support with conditions (describe below)

18 responses

Not Support

15 responses

Support

6 responses

Please describe the conditions required for your support

Question left blank

21 responses

As previously mentioned in each section, we think that no matter what the land size, neighbours should always have the ability to appeal and make their objections/concerns knows. We spend a lot of money when we buy our properties and should always be able to voice our concerns to council if there is something that will affect our enjoyment of our own property. We think that you need to not only consider land size, but also the proximity of the site to the residence on adjacent land. Just because someone has a large piece of land, does not mean that they will be using the part of their land that is farthest away from their neighbours to setup their Pumpkin patch, weddings, wine tastings, etc. The placement of the "venue" can have a big impact on neighbours and how much the agribusiness & agritourism will impact their daily lives. Noise. We have had a big issue with the temporary Trestles Edge and how noisy their event venue is. We didn't notice anything in the document about noise levels. Would that fall under the regular residential noise bylaw? We think that there should be more rules than just that bylaw that controls the noise. We currently have to deal with loud noise from around 5 pm till 1 am every time there is an event at Trestles Edge. We should have a way to make our concerns known to bylaw before the 11 pm noted in the noise bylaws. Agritourism Event - Is overnighting allowed? Trestles Edge allows overnight camping, which is a concern for us. We didn't see anything in the document that addresses this. We do not feel that overnighting should be permitted.

1 response

There should be a distinction between someone living on there residence property in Sturgeon County, who wants to live there and operate a business from there property; and someone else who buys a property in Sturgeon County with no intention on living on the property but with the sole intention on using the property as a commercial venture. This needs to be part of the criteria, also the tax basis should be different with the property used solely as a commercial enterprise being in a commercial tax bracket higher then the resident with who operates a business at there place of residence. People operating a business from there resident property will be in general more responsible to there community and to the County, strictly commercial ventures will come and go and with little thought to there neighbors or surrounding community or Sturgeon County.

Amplified sound, music, crowd-generated noise and vehicles need ample space and not impact neighbouring residents. Traffic volume and safety are crucial. Timing of events is important; running every weekend of the summer can impact other properties. Support for surrounding properties should be taken into account, for enforcing regulations and providing compensation when it does not go well, so residents are not left to deal it with on their own. Some of the damage deposit for events like weddings may need to be shared with residents if affected. The link to agriculture and/or nature needs to be simple and clear, and bring benefit to more than the just the business owner. Researching the impact on the ecosystem and environment well before anything advances is crucial. All of life is connected, even beyond business and residents!

1 response

As mentioned under Agritourism, I would like the opportunity to discuss what can be done to ensure that current operating businesses are not negatively impacted by the defintions and proposed criteria. I have emailed my current proposal information that has been used the past two seasons when applying for temporary event permits. This information may be used by the task force for further discussions regarding the operation of like businesses. I am happy to discuss further if clarification and feedback is required. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

1 response

If a land use is within a certain distance of a residential dwelling the landowner should only have a permit approved with consultation of the neighbor to lessen the impact to the neighbor's privacy and enjoyment of their property. Someone with a one hectare lot doesn't want to be surrounded by a pumpkin patch or corn maze with screaming kids running around all summer. The neighbors would lose so much value on their land it would be criminal. Not to mention the increased traffic and potential safety on the road in front of their home.

1 response

Consideration to noise and traffic is the upmost important item to success and community satisfaction. Our experience with Trestle's Edge near our acreage has been far less than satisfactory for both noise and traffic and affects a number of our neighbors. These need a lot of space and distance from residences as it can directly affect the enjoyment of each resident. We certainly amongst other neighbors we have talked to moved to the country for more noise and traffic.

1 response

all natural uses of the land would be fine if they enhanced the environment of the county, the party uses seem like a direct detriment other than the possibility of earning some revenue for the county, at the expense of the current land owners. and the more industrial uses if regulated properly should be a benefit as well. As long as consideration is made for the existing occupants of the land within the county.

1 response

Consideration to noise and traffic is paramount to success and community satisfaction. Our experience with Trestles Edge near our farm has been far less than satisfactory for both noise and traffic and affects a number of adjacent properties. These need a lot of space and distance from neighbors as it can directly affect the enjoyment of their property. No one moved to the country for more noise and traffic.

1 response

Noise and traffic issues are important considerations for community success. Our lived experience with Trestle's Edge, across the river from our home has been far less than satisfactory for both noise and traffic. These events affect a number of adjacent properties, so there needs to be adequate space and distance from neighbours.

Right of adjacent landowners to receive notice of proposed uses, right of adjacent landowners to make submissions and right of appeal.

1 response

Just the same comment as I made for the first proposed land use, there may need to be an appeal process to protect neighbors.

1 response

Agritourism events should be allowed on smaller parcels of land

1 response

As noted in previous comments.

1 response

Please explain why you do not support

Agribusiness Agritourism Review Task Force Sturgeon County, AB. RE; Residence Experience Adjacent to Trestles Edge Dear Review Board, Further to our submittal on the supplied form, we thought this letter would assist the board with our view and to add to the form the comments of our experience with an existing events center. Trestles Edge has operated for approximately 2 years that we are aware of. We were only notified by our neighbours and not the operators of Trestles Edge starting their business. Trestles Edge did not come to see us to discuss any temporary use of having events at the property they own. We are not sure why as we are extremely close in proximity to their business and just hope it was an oversight of not coming to see us. The first year we recall was fairly quiet with some events occurring in the afternoon, none that created much noise or traffic in the evening (limited of course by COVID restrictions). Last summer the operation had celebrations that began in the afternoon and carried on till well after midnight. The area could be rented for the entire weekend and included RV spots. The venue is located very near 4 residences and the noise during many events can be clearly heard even during the wedding speeches. Our residence being higher up on a landscape view than the other 3 residences, the noise carries very well. As residents, our enjoyment of our properties like many others occurs on the weekends and evenings since we have resided here from 1992 to present. We experienced individuals accessing the railroad line very late in the evening and the railroad line is beside our residence. We do not think it is appropriate for individuals to access this rail road line and it is a safety issue – we are not 100% sure it was individuals from the event going on at Trestle's Edge however there were no other vehicles we could see nearby. In Alberta we have precious few warm summer evenings and unfortunately this timing matches perfectly with an outdoor wedding event. The facility can and has operated mid week until the late hours also and for most who work early the next day the noise is an obvious annoyance. Trestle's Edge access is at a convergence of the railroad, river, busy highway, and a secondary road with residential traffic and a large farming operation. This perfect storm of traffic and location has already been the scene of several both small and serious accidents (including deaths). We have had our own incident and know first hand the dangerous harm that can potentially increase. From our own perspective, our expectation of a neighbor is much less noise and traffic. Our reason for choosing to live and grow our family in the country is to be of residences and agriculture. Being given land to pass down to our own children to enjoy country living is what we are striving for and hoping for our own children to be able to benefit from this as well. Extreme caution needs to be taken on this type of party venue to consider proximity to fellow neighbors and traffic volume. Appropriate locations are rare given the nature of the business and the number of residents now in the county. [redacted]

Dear Review Board, Further to our submittal on the supplied form, we thought it appropriate to add to the form with comments on our experience with an existing events center. Trestles Edge has operated for 2 years. The first year was fairly muted with some events occurring in the afternoon, none that created much noise or traffic in the evening (limited by COVID restrictions). Last summer the operation had celebrations that began in the afternoon and carried on till well after 1;00am. The area could be rented for the entire weekend and included RV spots. The venue is located very near 4 residences and the noise during many events can be clearly heard even during the wedding speeches. At this location, the noise carries very well. As a resident, our enjoyment of our properties occurs on the weekends and evenings. This is the same time as a wedding event. In Alberta we have precious few warm summer evenings and unfortunately this timing matches perfectly with an outdoor wedding event. The facility can and has operated mid week until the late hours also and for most who work early the next day the noise is an obvious annoyance. Trestles edge access is at a convergence of the railroad, river, busy highway, and a secondary road with residential traffic and a large farming operation. This perfect storm of traffic and location has already been the scene of several both small and serious accidents (a number of deaths). From a residents' perspective, our expectation of a neighbor is much less noise and traffic. Our expectation of the area is what it has historically been; residences and agriculture. Events facilities change the quiet country life into something much different and our ability to enjoy it. Caution needs to be taken on this type of party venue to consider proximity to neighbors and traffic volume. Appropriate locations are rare given the nature of the business and the number of residents now in the county.

You should not be able to take current land designations and now say those designations are able to do functions beyond what was previously defined, and say that neighbours would have no opportunity to appeal any permitted use approved. Additionally, anything that involves a fee over and above the cost to sell an agriculture product (example selling a vegetable at a reasonable cost only) should not be allowed. This all moves into the territory of a business, and we need to address permits and requirements as such. No resident would want to live next door to a business! This is farmland, and we are rural. Consideration needs to be made for how close neighbouring farms are located, as well roads, access, etc. These proposed changes are too broad, too vague, and attempt to give too much power to the applicant and the county. YOU CANNOT CHANGE THE CORE FUNCTION OF A ZONED PROPERTY.

---

1 response

I don't think anyone wants a wedding reception in the backyard with potential drunk people wandering around, traffic not to mention noise. I moved to the country to avoid these things. Judging by this proposition I would not have a say in these events. I am not ok with this at all. I am surrounded by land that hopes to be used for such an event and they have in the past. There were drunks wander on my property, people trying to park in my driveway and fireworks and music till well after midnight. I'm not sure why anyone would be ok with this, or want to support the county doing this or why neighbors do not get a say in events on the larger land parcels. I support small and local businesses but tell me why this has to be right behind my house and I get no say in it? Not cool at all

---

1 response

The current land owner ran several Weddings in the land he owns directly behind our and our immediate neighbors property. There were several cases of trespassing as well as noise levels that would not be acceptable within city limits. Within a soundproof permeant structure these activities are able to go on with little to no interruption of the surrounding occupants. But when the activity is held in a tent, in the relative quiet of a rural setting the sound is even more intrusive. County based halls have been in existence for a substantial amount of time in the province, and are run successfully with little impact to the surrounding land owners.

I don't know that you can strictly categorize Agribusiness and Agritourism into these categories you have here now, in fact "Agribusiness and Agritourism" itself I don't think covers the gambit of different uses of property for other then farming or residential uses. There needs to be better definition and structure to what Agribusiness and Agritourism is and where it lies in the context of all enterprises operating now or in the future of Sturgeon County. Show the business chart for Sturgeon and where Agribusiness and Agritourism falls within the chart of Sturgeon planning and operations.

1 response

I believe my previous answers speak for themselves. Landowners must be consulted prior to any new activities are approved no matter what size of land the proposal is made on. To me that is only common courtesy and common sense if you want good neighbors. If I want to add a new business to my farm, or new buildings even, it seems I must get approval from neighbors. This plan is much more invasive and lifestyle altering.

1 response

All development should be notifying neighbors regardless of the property size. This process is very confusing to understand from the viewpoint of someone new looking at it. Might be simple to those that have been working on this for months/years. I don't support the process as it was very limited mail out information , hard to find the survey even when specifically looking for it and a short deadline.

1 response

I am concerned that this survey was very hard to access. No mailout received and very hard to find on the county website. I don't agree that neighbors do not have the opportunity to appeal that decision on AG-Major (16 ha or larger in size), and • AG-Minor (between 4 ha and 16.9 ha). County currently has poor gravel road conditions, how can they possibly handle the extra traffic load.

1 response

It is not right for the landowner to increase the value of their land at the expense of the neighbors land value. Landowners should not be able to develop their land if it impacts the enjoyment of the neighbors. The neighbors must be consulted if the business is within a certain distance of a dwelling. No exceptions.

1 response

I have reservations due to the historical evidence of damage to land from large gatherings such as garbage and physical land damage to the tourism site and adjacent land. Also high traffic and noise pollution caused by businesses on agricultural land in our county and other Alberta counties.

Our main concerns are noise, traffic and proximity to affected neighbours. Our lived experience with Trestle's Edge wedding events has been very unsatisfactory. We are including more detailed comments in an attached letter to the Agribusiness Agritourism Review Task Force. Please review.

1 response

Of course it's nice to have the community grow but no one is going to like hearing that neighbours do not get to appeal anything. We live where we live because we want to and then to have something pop up next door and you have no say over is not the way to do it

1 response

As a land owner of AG residential surrounded by what would be considered AG major and AG minor, I would be extremely frustrated not to be given notification of a permit request and if was not in favour then follow a process to appeal.

1 response

There will be no consultation with adjacent landowners for larger parcels of land. The county may approve without landowners knowing could set up beside their land. This is not transparent, and only benefits larger landowners.

1 response

See previous. As drafted, none of these "permitted uses" comply with the last aspect of the guiding principal of adjacent landlowners' right to peaceful (agricultural) use of their own property.

1 response

Agritourism Event is a "NO" for us. Wedding Venues are simply too difficult to satisfy all the needs of a Venue, loud with many people and so many issues, out in the middle of a rural property.

1 response

The need for this bylaw (particularly now) is great but the manner in which this proposal has been communicated is insufficient to the intended scope.

1 response

i do not support, neighbours of AG Major and AG minor are not informed of permit and event requests as well have no appeal process.

1 response

I would want the opportunity as a land owner to share my opinion in the event I feel I can contribute something worthwhile.

1 response

My biggest concern with this is the traffic and noise that it could bring to the homes surrounding the venue.

1 response

Details explained in previous section. Just a few concerns of things we don't think were addressed.

1 response

There are still some unanswered question that we have that leave us to no choice but to not support.

1 response

In ALL CASES neighbours should have the right to appeal the potential issuance of a permit.

1 response

Agritourism criteria will not support my current operating business in the County.

1 response

needs better consultation see privious page

1 response

I Support with conditions attached.

1 response

Not being able to appeal land use

1 response

See previous explanation.

1 response

Tell us about yourself

View options

- I am a resident located next to or near an existing agribusiness or agritourism operation

16 responses

- I am a resident with general interest in agribusiness and agritourism

8 responses

- I am an agricultural operator in Sturgeon County

5 responses

- I have an existing agribusiness or agritourism operation

2 responses

- I am interested in starting an agribusiness or agritourism operation

◉ Landowner in county

1 response

◉ I have parents and family members in Sturgeon County, and was a resident growing up.

1 response

◉ We are resident/agricultural operator located next to an existing Agritourism Event operation

1 response

◉ I am a resident who lives on a small plot of land who could potentially have an agribusiness or agritourism operation located nearby.

1 response

◉ Resident that does not feel affected by these changes

1 response

◉ I am considered AG residential land owner who is surrounded by Ag Major and AG Minor and am concerned with proposed permit approval criteria criteria

In which Division of Sturgeon County do you reside?

View options

- Division 1

13 responses

- Division 3

11 responses

- Division 5

5 responses

- Division 4

3 responses

- Not sure

3 responses

- Division 2

2 responses

- I do not reside within Sturgeon County

2 responses