



Parkland County Bylaw 2019-01 Cannabis Related Amendments to the Land Use Bylaw

# What We Heard Report

*One Parkland: Powerfully Connected.*

Planning & Development Services

**FEBRUARY 22, 2019**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Public Engagement Objectives.....	3
Identified Stakeholders .....	3
External Stakeholder Engagement.....	3
Internal Stakeholder Engagement .....	3
Methods of Engagement .....	3
What We Heard.....	5
Open House Questions/Comments.....	5
Engagement Summary .....	6
Appendix A: Public Open House Advertisement.....	7
Appendix B: Public Open House Display Boards.....	8
Appendix C: Proposed Specific Regulations (public handout).....	18

## **Introduction**

This “What We Heard” Report has been prepared by Planning and Development Services - Development Planning and describes the public engagement process, outlines the stakeholders involved, and summarizes stakeholder feedback, related to Bylaw 2019-01.

## **Public Engagement Objectives**

1. Inform Parkland County and interested parties of the purpose of Bylaw 2019-01.
2. Learn more about public opinion on different scales of cannabis facilities.
3. Encourage feedback from residents on the draft development regulations.

## **Identified Stakeholders**

### EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- Residents in the Plan Area
- Agencies and organizations

### INTERNAL STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- **Public Engagement Committee:** The Project Team used the County’s existing Public Engagement Committee to notify internal departments of the engagement sessions.
- **Development Services Department Meetings:** The Project Team liaised with internal departments via brief presentations during existing department meetings.

## **Methods of Engagement**

Parkland County focused on following methods to engage the public and stakeholders.

- ❖ Open House Advertisements
  - The open house advertisement was published in the following publications for two (2) consecutive weeks (January 25<sup>th</sup> and February 1<sup>st</sup>) in advance of the open house
    - Spruce Grove Examiner
    - Stony Plain Reporter
  - A copy of the advertisement can be found in Appendix A.

- ❖ Digital Board
  - The open house advertisement was displayed on Parkland County Centre's digital display board for one (1) week prior to the events.
- ❖ Social Media
  - The open house advertisement was posted to the following Parkland County social media accounts for two (2) consecutive weeks in advance of the open house: Parkland County's social media accounts:
    - Parkland County Facebook page
    - Parkland County Twitter page
- ❖ Website
  - The open house advertisement was posted to the Parkland County Events webpage in advance of the events.
- ❖ Public Open House
  - Two public open houses were held in different locations in Parkland County:
    - February 6, 2019; 6:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.; Parkland County Centre, 53109A Highway 779, Parkland County, AB
    - February 7, 2019; 5:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.; Entwistle Community Hall, 4921 51 St, Entwistle, AB

## What We Heard

The following questions/comments occurred during the open house. Questions were provided on boards and attendees attached sticky notes to the boards. These notes were later transcribed and summarized into the format provided here. In addition, 5 responses were provided to Development Services in the days following the open house, this responses have also been included here.

### OPEN HOUSE QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Posted Question	Summary of response
Is Country Residential (excluding Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivisions) an appropriate area for a Cannabis Micro Production Facility? Why or Why Not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses were overwhelmingly in support of this.</li> <li>Some individuals likened it to horticultural uses, others stated that the impacts of this sort of operation in Country Residential will be minimal.</li> <li>More than one respondent cited that size needs to be monitored to ensure the projects are not too large and that the nuisance elements (noise, odor) need to be addressed.</li> </ul>
Is a 150m setback warranted?  <i>Note: This question was posted in reference to Cannabis Micro Production Facilities in proximity to Multi-parcel residential subdivisions.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The responses to this question were evenly split between "yes" and the "the amount is too much."</li> <li>No one suggested that a setback was not warranted, those who disagreed with the amount felt that 75 – 100m would be sufficient.</li> <li>One resident cited concerns over odor as a justification for the setback.</li> </ul>
Do you feel proposed amendments will have an impact on Parkland County If so, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A majority of respondents felt that the amendments would have an impact and that this impact would be positive in nature. No respondent cited a negative impact.</li> <li>Impacts focused on the economy, jobs, and taxation. Respondents are optimistic that the Cannabis Industry will be of benefit to Parkland County and Residents.</li> <li>Isolated statements suggested that the amendments could contribute to keeping the younger generation on the farm and attracting people to move into the county.</li> </ul>

Posted Question	Summary of response
Do you agree with the proposed amendments? Why or why not? <i>Note: Reference is to amendments displayed as a handout at the open house.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents overwhelmingly support the amendments, especially the micro-production use.</li> </ul>
Should Cannabis Production Facilities be allowed in Agricultural areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A majority of respondents stated that Production Facilities should be allowed in agricultural areas.</li> <li>Two respondents stated that production should not be allowed on agricultural areas because it is not using the land, and it is a use better suited to an industrial area.</li> </ul>
Should there be a restriction on maximum facility size?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers varied a great deal to this question.</li> <li>Only one respondent stated that there should be no restriction to facility size, suggesting that it should be assessed based on impact to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Another respondent likened it to a pig or chicken farm, suggesting the size should be equivalent.</li> <li>A final idea was to correlate the size of facility to the size of land parcel.</li> </ul>
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Micro-production is an appropriate use in AGG, CR, RC, ANC, and AGR, but this should be restricted to production alone (no processing).</li> <li>One individual suggested that major production should be a permitted use in BI.</li> </ul>

## **Engagement Summary**

- ❖ The purpose of the open houses was to gather information on Bylaw 2019-01.
  - February 6, 2019; 6:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.; Parkland County Centre, 53109A Highway 779, Parkland County, AB
  - February 7, 2019; 5:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.; Entwistle Community Hall, 4921 51 St, Entwistle, AB
- ❖ Attendance:
  - Parkland County Centre: 9 attendees
  - Entwistle Community Hall: 13 attendees
- ❖ General notes: In both locations, the majority of attendees were interested in the possibility of opening a business related to Cannabis. A majority of these were interested in micro-production.

## **Appendix A: Public Open House Advertisement**

# **OPEN HOUSE**

## **BYLAW 2019-01**



**Parkland County is preparing to amend its Land Use Bylaw to allow for Cannabis Retail Sales and Cannabis Production Facilities in certain land use districts with associated regulations.**

**To learn more, please join us at one of our open houses:**

**PARKLAND COUNTY CENTRE:**

**WED. FEB. 6, 2019 | 6:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.**

PARKLAND COUNTY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
53109A HWY 779, PARKLAND COUNTY

**ENTWISTLE:**

**THR. FEB. 7, 2019 | 5:00 P.M. - 7:00 P.M.**

ENTWISTLE COMMUNITY HALL  
4921-51 STREET, ENTWISTLE

**For more information, please contact Rachelle Trovato, Development Planner by phone 780-968-8443 ext. 8321 or email [rachelle.trovato@parklandcounty.com](mailto:rachelle.trovato@parklandcounty.com)**

## **Appendix B: Public Open House Display Boards**

Disclaimer: Appendix B represent information shared with the public at the Parkland County Bylaw 2019-01 open house and is not a final copy for approval.



# **WELCOME TO PARKLAND COUNTY'S LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT # 2019-01 CANNABIS RELATED AMENDMENTS OPEN HOUSE**

### **Why are we doing this?**

Parkland County is updating its Land Use Bylaw 2017-18 to enhance provincial regulations as they relate to the production and distribution of cannabis. This amendment specifies where Cannabis Retail Sales and Cannabis Production Facilities can be located in the County.

Parkland County Administration would like to hear your feedback on the proposed regulations in order to ensure they are the right fit for our residents and business owners.

At tonight's open house you will find:

- A timeline of where we are in the process
- Current and proposed districts for Cannabis Retail Sales and Cannabis Production Facility Use
- The draft amendments to the Land Use Bylaw for your review and comment
- Opportunity to provide feedback on micro-production facilities
- Parkland County staff available to answer questions you may have

 **have  
your  
say**

**LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01 – CANNABIS LAND USE** 



# LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01

## Who is responsible for what?

As a municipal government, Parkland County is responsible for regulations surrounding the location of retail sales, public education and consumption, and land use/zoning.

Activity	Federal	Provincial	Municipal
Possession Limits	✓		
Trafficking	✓		
Advertisement & Packaging	✓		
Impaired Driving	✓	✓	
Medical Cannabis	✓		
Seed-to-sale Tracking	✓		
Production (cultivation/processing)	✓		
Age Limit (federal minimum)	✓		
Public Health	✓	✓	
Education	✓	✓	✓
Taxation	✓	✓	✓
Home Cultivation	✓		
Workplace Safety		✓	
Distribution & Wholesaling		✓	
Retail Model		✓	
Retail Location and Rules		✓	✓
Regulatory Compliance	✓	✓	
Public Consumption		✓	✓
Land Use/Zoning			✓



## WHERE ARE WE IN THE PROCESS?

### February 2018

Open House held on new land use definitions and general comments on Cannabis Retail Stores and Cannabis Production Facilities.

### March 2018

Bylaw 2018-03 approved by Council - defining cannabis and adding cannabis retail sales and cannabis production facility as new land use classifications.

### September 2018

Council passes Consumption of Cannabis in Public Places Bylaw - disallowing cannabis use in any public place in Parkland County.

### September - December 2018

Research into potential land use impacts of cannabis retail sales and cannabis production facilities.

### January 2019

Administration developed draft land use policies and zoning.

### February 2019

Engage residents & business community on draft land use regulations.

### February 2019

Review public comment regarding proposed land use regulations.

### March 2019

Bring revised Bylaw 2019-01 in front of Council.



LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01 – CANNABIS LAND USE

## REDEFINING EXISTING USE DEFINITIONS

### Cannabis Retail Sales

means a development, or any part thereof, used for the retail sale of Cannabis as licensed by the Province of Alberta.

Does not include Cannabis Production Facility or Convenience Retail.

### Cannabis Production Facility

means a development, or any part thereof, that involves the production, cultivation, and growth of Cannabis and Cannabis products within a surface area of greater than 200 m<sup>2</sup> (2152.8 ft<sup>2</sup>).

This includes one or more of the following: making, testing, manufacturing, assembling or ~~altering the chemical and physical properties of~~ processing finished and semi-finished goods and products.

This use class does not preclude the storage and transporting of products and materials related to Cannabis production. Retail sale of cannabis is not permitted.

*Note: The use definitions related to cannabis were approved by Council in 2018. Administration is proposing minor amendments to two of the existing definitions in order to provide greater clarity to residents and business owners.*



## NEW USE CLASS FOR CONSIDERATION

### Cannabis Micro Production Facility

means a development, or any part thereof, that involves the production, cultivation, and growth of Cannabis and Cannabis products **within a surface area of 200 m<sup>2</sup> (2152.8 ft<sup>2</sup>) or less.**

This includes one or more of the following: making, testing, manufacturing, or assembling finished and semi-finished goods and products. This use class does not preclude the storage and transporting of products and materials related to Cannabis production. **Retail sale of cannabis is not permitted.**

**Is Country Residential (excluding Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivisions) an appropriate area for a Cannabis Micro Production Facility?**

**Why or why not?**

**Is a 150m setback warranted?**



## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### Cannabis Retail Sales

➔ **WHERE IS THIS USE CURRENTLY ALLOWED?**

Cannabis Retail Sales use is currently not found in any of Parkland County's land use districts. The proposed amendments would provide the opportunity for these businesses to locate in appropriate areas in the County.

➔ **PARKLAND COUNTY'S APPROACH**

- Comparable to a commercial use such as liquor sales and distribution.

Cannabis Retail Sales Use is proposed to be a DISCRETIONARY USE in the following land use districts:

**RC** – Rural Centre District

**HC** – Highway Commercial District

**LC** – Local Commercial District

**BI** – Business Industrial District

**MI** – Medium Industrial District

- ➔ Cannabis retail sales use shall not be located within 100m of any parcel that contains a provincial healthcare facility, a school or building containing educational services, or a school reserve or municipal and school reserve.



## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### Cannabis Production Facility

➔ **WHERE IS THIS USE CURRENTLY ALLOWED?**

Cannabis Production Facility use is currently listed as a DISCRETIONARY USE in the **AGG** – Agricultural General District.

➔ **PARKLAND COUNTY'S APPROACH**

- Highest risk of nuisance likely to come from truck traffic to and from the development
- Considered a type of industrial use with minimal nuisance impacts
- There is opportunity to locate facilities in agricultural areas if reasonable compatible with adjacent properties

Cannabis Production Facility use is proposed to be a DISCRETIONARY USE in the following land use districts:

**AGG** – Agricultural General District\*

**AGI** – Agricultural Industry Development District

**BI** – Business Industrial District

**RE** – Resource Extraction District

**RIC** – Rural Industrial / Commercial District

Cannabis Production Facility use is proposed to be a PERMITTED USE in the following land use districts:

**BIR** – Regional Business Industrial District

**MI** – Medium Industrial District

- ➔ A cannabis production facility cannot be located within 150m of a multi-parcel residential subdivision or a row house development.



\*Cannabis Production Facility is already listed as a discretionary use in the AGG district.

LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01 – CANNABIS LAND USE

## THOUGHTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Please see the available handouts for the draft regulations.

**Do you feel proposed amendments will have  
an impact on Parkland County?**

**If so, why?**

**Do you agree with the proposed amendments?  
Why or why not?**



## **CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITIES IN RURAL AGRICULTURAL AREAS**

**Should Cannabis Production Facilities be  
allowed in Agricultural areas?**

**Should there be a restriction on maximum  
facility size?**

**Any other concerns/comments?**







## **Appendix C: Proposed Specific Regulations (public handout)**

Disclaimer: Appendix C represent information shared with the public as a handout at the Parkland County Bylaw 2019-01 open house and is not a final copy for approval.

### **PROPOSED SPECIFIC USE REGULATIONS**

#### **12.27 Cannabis Retail Sales**

- 1** The Development Authority shall not approve a development permit for Cannabis Retail Sales use unless, in its opinion, it is satisfied that the proposed use is suitable, harmonious, appropriate, and compatible with the existing quality of life in the surrounding neighbourhood.
- 2** When evaluating the appropriateness of a proposed Cannabis Retail Sales use, the Development Authority shall consider:
  - a) compatibility of the proposed use with adjacent and neighbouring land uses;
  - b) impact of the proposed use on existing traffic volumes and patterns of flow;
  - c) appropriate vehicle parking and site access/egress requirements (the location of access/egress points shall not route traffic through residential areas); and
  - d) appropriate site security/fencing requirements.
- 3** Cannabis Retail Sales use shall not be located within 100.0 m of any parcel that contains:
  - a) a provincial healthcare facility;
  - b) a school or building containing Educational Services; or,
  - c) a school reserve or municipal and school reserve.

The separation distance shall be measured from the exterior wall of the Cannabis Retail Sales development to the nearest point of the parcel boundary containing the above facilities, buildings or reserves.
- 4** The proposed development shall meet all federal, provincial and all other relevant statutory requirements prior to commencement of the operation, and provide evidence of applicable federal and provincial approvals to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.

# **DRAFT**



LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01 – CANNABIS LAND USE



## PROPOSED SPECIFIC USE REGULATIONS

### 12.26 Cannabis Production Facility

- 1** A Cannabis Production Facility use may be a Permitted or Discretionary Use in certain Industrial Districts, subject to the standard development regulations, design and character, landscaping, parking and loading, signage and other applicable requirements of the respective Industrial Districts.
- 2** A Cannabis Production Facility use may be a Discretionary use in certain Agricultural Districts if, in the opinion of the Development Authority, the potential intensity of the use is appropriate and reasonably compatible with the nature and uses of the surrounding properties.
- 3** When evaluating the appropriateness for a proposed Cannabis Production Facility use in certain Agricultural Districts where it is a Discretionary use, the Development Authority shall consider:
  - a) The proposed site shall be suitable and appropriate for the scale and intensity of the proposed facility. To assess site suitability, the Development Authority may consider factors such as, but not limited to, size of the property, site servicing, distances to nearby residences, access to transportation networks, agricultural soil capacity, environmentally significant areas, and other unique site conditions.
  - b) A Cannabis Production Facility use shall not be located within 150.0 m from the boundary of a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision or a row house development.
    - i) The 150.0 m separation distance shall be measured from the boundary of the proposed development area to the boundary of the Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision or a row house development.
  - c) Landscaping and screening measures may be required at the discretion of the Development Authority to minimize any adverse visual impact to nearby residences and public roadways.
  - d) Loading, storage and trash collection areas shall be located to the rear or sides of the principal building and shall be screened from any nearby residences or public roadways.
  - e) Vehicular entrances and exits as well as on-site pedestrian and vehicular routes shall be designed in a manner that provides a safe and clearly defined circulation pattern.
  - f) Hours of heavy equipment traffic may be restricted at the discretion of the Development Authority to minimize any adverse impact to any nearby residences.
  - g) The Development Authority may require the applicant to conduct and document public engagement prior to submitting a development permit application for a Cannabis Production Facility use if, in the Development Authority's opinion, the development may present significant adverse impact to nearby properties.
- 4** A Cannabis Production Facility use shall incorporate Dark Sky compliant practices and measures to minimize light pollution to nearby properties.

# DRAFT





## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PROCESS

### 16.7A Application for Cannabis Production Facility

- 5 The proposed development shall meet all federal, provincial and all other relevant statutory requirements prior to commencement of the operation, and provide evidence of applicable federal and provincial approvals to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.
- 6 In addition to the development permit application requirements stipulated in Subsections 16.3.1 and 16.3.2, a development permit application for a Cannabis Production Facility use in applicable Agricultural Districts may be required to provide the following information at the discretion of the Development Authority:
  - a) operational details such as number of employees, hours of operation, types of activities, among others;
  - b) details on on-site water and septic management systems;
  - c) traffic impact study showing the type, volume, frequency of vehicle movements and the transportation routes to be utilized, and the need for any off-site road infrastructure improvements;
  - d) stormwater management system and fire suppression ponds, if applicable;
  - e) landscaping and screening from residences and public roads;
  - f) public consultation summary;
  - g) biophysical assessments if the property intersects with an environmentally significant area; and,
  - h) any other information required by the Development Authority respecting the site or adjacent lands.

# DRAFT



LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT# 2019-01 – CANNABIS LAND USE



## **Appendix D: Comments Received at Public Open Houses**

Note: Appendix D provides the transcribed comments that were received at the Public Open Houses.

### **Micro-Production**

#### **In country residential?**

- If kept small should be allowed everywhere
- Yes
- Yes, to allow people to sustain their own methods
- Yes
- Yes
- Should be permitted not discretionary
- Add these ANC for micro scale. AGR if the other municipalities are on board
- Add for micro CR – if they meet the setbacks
- Anywhere “horticultural use” is allowed micro should be
- A 200 m<sup>2</sup> facility should produce approx. 180 lbs per harvest so not heavy traffic
- Yes, it creates economic opportunity for land owners with minimal impact on land use
- Consider adding rural central district to the permitted areas for micro cultivation (production). Especially on non-nuisance compliant properties.
- Micro processing included in CR zoning
- No different than an oats farmer processing their harvest into cereal
- Done nicely: attractive, small enough so odor would not be noticed
- CR should be considered for micro production facilities. I feel it would be in the benefit of the county and all entrepreneurs. Creating more opportunities for current land owners.
- Can bylaw be flexible enough to allow new innovation? (Eg. Adding fish farm to a micro facility)
- CR is appropriate: not in subdivision; good neighbour principles apply; attractive building, land; appropriate setback
- Yes, should be permitted in AGG, CR, RC, ANC, AGR but restricted to production, exclude processing

#### **150 m setback warranted?**

- Yes
- Yes, because of the smell
- Some setback is appropriate but 150 m is excessive. Maybe 75m-100m
- 100m is adequate
- Way less noise from cultivation or production facility than camp ground
- 100 m is enough
-

**General:**

- Only requires 1-6 employees, therefore impact on traffic would be minimal
- Should be allowed in ANC district as a discretionary use
- Micro producers is a good idea even with all issues (*no issues were cited or discussed on site with County representatives*)

**Thoughts from the Public**

**Amendments will have an impact on the county?**

- Yes, it will provide jobs
- Yes, it will bring more employment to the area
- Yes, it will provide more employment, also we need more taxes paid by industry
- Keeping younger generation in agriculture
- Providing opportunities for retirees to invest in their property with an excellent return
- Growing the economy
- Increase tax revenue
- Increase people moving to county (friendly business environment)
- I don't see any negative impact
- Not a big impact: more tax income; may have more traffic; people stopping for gas/food

**Do you agree with the amendments?**

- Early to say for sure but increased flexibility makes better things happen
- I think the proposed amendments are good. I'd like to see more specific bylaws for micro, since the impact of micro facility is much less
- Yes! For micro facilities too!
- For micro, yearly product could be loaded into a single pick-up truck
- Yes to these

**Cannabis production facilities in rural agricultural areas**

**Should cannabis production facilities be allowed in Ag areas?**

- ABSOLUTELY
- Yes
- Not really, will not be using the land so should be in non-agricultural areas
- Yes, I don't believe there would be any type of negative impact
- Yes
- Yes
- No, nature of the business warrants its location in industrial areas (hemp field is an appropriate use in agricultural area – CO<sub>2</sub> beneficial)

**Should there be a restriction on maximum facility size?**

- Yes, if too large (5000 ft<sup>2</sup>) should be rural ind. commercial
- Same as: chicken farm, pig farm. Larger facility needs more air handling units, etc.
- No, it should be assessed for impact on neighbouring parcels
- Maybe facility size should correlate to land size, and again, good neighbour policy regarding odor, traffic, great landscaping, etc.

## **Appendix E: Comments Received Following Public Open Houses (redacted)**

*Received via Email: February 8, 2019*

*Received by: Rachelle Trovato*

Dear Rachelle/Candace

It was great meeting with both of you yesterday at Entwistle. I would like to vote in favor of proposed Cannabis Retail Sales and production facility in Entwistle. I would also like to remind you at this time that I am willing to open the retail sale location at the following address in Entwistle.

[REDACTED]

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



*Received via Email: February 14, 2019*

*Received by: Rachelle Trovato*

Hi Rachelle,

Thanks for having me at the open house last week. Here is a summary of what we discussed;

IS Country residential and appropriate area for a cannabis micro production facility?

- As long as the company stays within the allotted footprint, there is definitely appropriate parcels in the ANC zoned areas and other residential/agg parcels that would have a low impact on environment, water and traffic. A micro-processor would be a wonderful opportunity for landowners to utilize and expand their economic impact in a positive manner in the county.
- Micro-Cultivation should be allowed on any zoned parcel that allows for horticultural use (discretionary or permitted) . ANC land would be an appropriate place as long as the company complied with all set backs and environmental protection measures. Water use, traffic, and odor seem to be the biggest concerns with this type of use.
  - Water use – Rainwater collection, water recycling technologies, proximity to water sources can all be considered on a case-by case basis.
  - Traffic – A microcultivation would need no more than 6 people at max harvest time. In comparison, a day care that has 10+ children would have more traffic than this, a campground would also have much more traffic.
  - Odor – Federal regulations cover this issue. Facilities must have a filtration system in place to meet standard regulations.
- 150m set-back should be reduced to 100m, the extra 50m may pigeon hole some land owners that may want to process cannabis. The development department can approve these on a case-by-case basis.

Do you feel proposed amendments will have an impact on Parkland County? Yes, it will have a positive economic impact, it will open up a new agricultural sector for the county, it will generate more interest in small business and small agricultural projects. A micro-cultivation is the perfect vehicle for small business to diversify their agriculture and their income. Its an excellent opportunity to keep younger generations of farmers in the AG industry as well as providing a great retirement option for older farmers or landowners.

Yes I agree with the proposed amendments, with the addition of opening up other zones such as ANC and other similar parcels to be covered under discretionary use and approved by planning and development.

The 150m set back should be reduced to 100m

Yes Cannabis Production Facilities should be allowed in AG areas. Example, a farmer grows oats and wants to process them into feed or cereal on their land. This is an allowed use. This is no different than a cannabis farm and processing on the land. Its actually much less intensive on the land and surrounding landowners than say a Dog food factory, a daycare, a campground, a feed lot, a seed cleaning plant etc.

Microcultivations already have a restriction on facility size, so no added restrictions needed. Standard operations should be evaluated on the following; Indoor vs. Greenhouse – a greenhouse will create much more light pollution and odor is harder to control when in flowering stages if lights are needed. Indoor is completely contained. This should all be discussed and approved during development permit stage, rather than have prescriptive regulation. The regulation should not restrict this at this time, or it may warn off future investment by larger licensed producers in the county.

If you have any questions or need further clarification, please do not hesitate to reach out!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*Received via Email: February 9, 2019*

*Received by: Rachelle Trovato*

Thank you for the information. I have gone through all the existing bylaws in place as well as the possible amendments. And I do have an opinion on a couple of the questions asked.

First the question of whether "country residential" zoned properties are suitable for micro cannabis production facilities?

My answer to this would be Yes, and a setback would be appropriate. Yes for the reason being that micro cannabis production is being put in place as a way to allow smaller, perhaps family and friend ran businesses, the ability to have their place in this new emerging and growing industry without having to have huge financial backing to start up. The economy in our country and in our province is suffering and this new industry is hope for many out there as a way to create a new start and a way to get ahead. The micro grows are set up with smaller regulatory costs as well as less extensive security measures and clearances to minimize costs to make it cost effective for smaller scale growers. In allowing country residential properties to have such operations will further lower the costs for startup as many will already have suitable properties to build and also give other cost effective options rather than a small grower trying to purchase a quarter section of industrial land at a very large price tag.

The other question being whether agricultural land should be allowed to have cannabis production?

Again my answer would be Yes. And a more simple and short answer. Cannabis is now legal on the federal and provincial levels. It is a crop that is no different than any other crop whether it's fruits or vegetables or wheat etc. All of these crops are allowed to be grown as they are legal. Why should cannabis be looked at any different? The facilities used to grow cannabis are state of the art, high tech and high efficient. They do not allow for any pollens or contaminants to be released into the surrounding area as they are not allowed by federal law to do so. So if the argument is raised that it will contaminate the crops then it's a non issue as the facilities do not allow the escape of any pollens etc.

In closing there does have to be the proper measures put in place as to ensure the system that is put in place will run and prosper in all the ways it can as well as to help our economy grow. The legislation and bylaws put in place will determine the future of how this industry will grow and how it will allow Canadian citizens to make a living in it. If there were bylaws put into place to allow slightly less obstacles for Canadians and Albertans to obtain their position in this industry, I do know it could make a huge difference for a lot of people and for us all collectively. This industry will not only be legal in Canada it will be worldwide as we are seeing the start of and we as Canadians by taking the first steps may all have the opportunity of supplying a world market.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I hope you will consider my input.

██████████



*Received via Email: February 7, 2019*

*Received by: Rachelle Trovato*

Candace and Rachelle,

It was a pleasure to talk to both of you last night at the open house for the proposed cannabis bylaw amendment.

I wanted to take a moment and add my strong and unequivocal support for the amendments as a professional urban planner and as a representative of cannabis production related businesses looking to establish themselves within Parkland County.

At this moment, there are millions of dollars of cannabis production related investment looking to establish themselves within the greater Edmonton market. Without the approval of these bylaw amendments in the near future, companies looking to establish themselves will simply look elsewhere, to counties and cities which provide the most welcoming environment for cannabis production businesses. Reintroducing Cannabis Production Facility as a permitted and discretionary use within the industrial zones of Parkland County is a necessary step in facilitating these investments as it aligns with desired locations, transportation network and infrastructure needs.

That being said, I would advise that the proposed amendments would change Cannabis Production Facility use from a Discretionary Use to a Permitted Use within the BI - Business Industrial District. As much of Acheson is zoned BI, adding an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy and potential derailment to much of the industrial land within the county acts as a barrier for business development. As noted within Parkland County administration's notes on Cannabis Production Facilities, it is "a type of industrial with minimal nuisance impacts", of which, are primarily contained indoors. Additionally, similar to other industrial uses, "the highest risk of nuisance [is] likely to come from truck traffic to and from the development." Allowing development permit applications to be potentially delayed and bogged down in appeal hearings will set an unwelcoming precedent for future businesses. If Parkland County wants to be a leader and a welcoming partner for economic diversification and Cannabis Production, eliminating as many of the unnecessary regulatory hurdles is imperative.

Thank you for your time. I would be happy to speak to anyone in the future to convey my support and answer any questions as necessary.

Regards,

[Redacted signature block]