

**SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD  
PARKLAND COUNTY**

Legislative Services, Parkland County Centre  
53109A HWY 779  
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1  
Telephone: (780) 968-3234  
Fax: (780) 968-8413

HEARING DATE: August 17 and 21, 2020  
File No. 20-D-162

**Notice of Decision of Subdivision and Development Appeal Board**

**INTRODUCTION**

[1] The Development Authority of Parkland County (the "Development Authority") approved a development permit (20-D-162) for Steven Boonstra (the "Applicant") for a Home Based Business Level 2 (Off-site equipment repair business with minor small equipment repair and sale from the existing shop), located at 28, 27005 Township Road 511, and legally described as Lot 7, Block 3, Plan 7821013 Chelsea Estates, NE-1-51-27-W4 (the "Lands") on July 8, 2020.

[2] On July 24, 2020, Grant Schick appealed the development permit.

[3] The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the "Board") heard the appeal on August 17 and 21, 2020 via teleconference in accordance with Meeting Procedures (COVID-19 Suppression) Regulation, AR 50/2020.

**PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

**A. Board Members**

[4] At the outset of the appeal, the Chair requested confirmation from all parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the Board hearing the appeal. None of the persons in attendance had any objection to the members of the Board hearing the appeal.

[5] Board Member Marlene Chambers was present and heard evidence from the hearing on August 17, 2020. She was unable to attend on August 21, 2020. As such, she did not participate in the deliberations of the Board with respect to this decision.

**B. Exhibits**

[6] The Board marked the exhibits as set out at the end of this decision.

[7] On August 17, 2020, Mr. Schick identified that he had not received the exhibits before the Board. The hearing was adjourned to August 21, 2020 to allow him to receive a copy of the

exhibits. Mr. Schick confirmed on August 21, 2020 that he had received a copy of the exhibits and reviewed them.

### **C. Miscellaneous**

[8] The appeal was filed in time, in accordance with section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26 (the "MGA").

[9] The Board is satisfied that it has jurisdiction to deal with this matter. There were no objections to the proposed hearing process. There were no preliminary matters raised at the beginning of the hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD**

[10] The Board DENIES the appeal and upholds the Development Authority's decision to approve development permit 20-D-162. The development permit for Home Based Business Level 2 (Off-site equipment repair business with minor small equipment repair and sale from the existing shop) is confirmed with the conditions as set out on pages 14-15 of the Agenda Package.

### **SUMMARY OF HEARING**

[11] The following is a brief summary of the oral and written evidence submitted to the Board. At the beginning of the hearing, the Board indicated that it had reviewed all the written submissions filed in advance of the hearing.

#### **Development Authority**

[12] The Lands are located within the CR – Country Residential District of Parkland County ("CR District").

[13] The Development Authority received a development permit application for off-site equipment repair business with minor small equipment repair and sale from the existing shop on June 26, 2020.

[14] On receipt of the development permit application, the Development Authority requested additional information from the Applicant. The Applicant provided further information.

[15] The Development Authority informed the Applicant that only a Home Based Business Level 1 or 2 was allowed within a multi-parcel residential subdivision pursuant to section 5.3 of the County's Land Use Bylaw 2017-18 (the "LUB"). A Home Based Business Level 2 cannot have outdoor storage with the exception of one vehicle and one trailer carrying equipment.

[16] The Applicant revised his development permit application to have all storage relating to the business contained within the existing shop with the exception of one truck and one trailer carrying equipment.

[17] The Development Authority approved the development permit on July 8, 2020 (the "Proposed Development") subject to 11 conditions (see pages 14-15/67).

[18] The Development Authority determined that the Proposed Development was a Home Based Business Level 2, which is a discretionary use within the CR District as outlined in Section 5.3 of the LUB.

[19] Home Based Business Level 2 is defined in the LUB as follows:

**HOME BASED BUSINESS LEVEL 2** means an occupation, trade, or craft for gain or support, and is secondary to the principal residential use. It may include some client visits and the parking of one commercial vehicle and may not include on-site employees except the resident and the resident's family who permanently reside in the dwelling. Typical secondary uses may include massage therapy, spa/esthetics services, dog grooming, landscaping/snow removal, dressmaking, hairdressing, home crafts and handicrafts, picture framing, delivery services, mobile food vendors or caterers, individual instruction to students, off-site mobile repairs and installation, janitorial services, mobile entertainment services and the carrying out of minor household appliance repair and automotive repair (does not include autobody repair).

[20] The Development Authority determined that the Proposed Development met the definition of Home Based Business Level 2 based on the following:

- a. The Proposed Development consists of an off-site repair business located on the Lands;
- b. Though repair work is done off-site, there will be storage, repair and sale of equipment conducted within the existing shop;
- c. The only employee is the resident/landowner, the Applicant;
- d. The traffic is comparable to other home based businesses;
- e. There is no off-site parking required;
- f. There will be occasional sale of equipment conducted from the Lands, which can consist of up to several clients visiting the Lands on a weekly basis; and
- g. The proposed hours of operation are Monday to Friday, 8 am to 5 pm.

[21] The Development Authority identified that the Municipal Development Plan, Bylaw 2017-14 (the "MDP") shows that the Lands are within the Country Residential area. The Development Authority indicated that the Proposed Development complies with section 5.0 of the MDP (Economic Competitiveness and Employment) in particular the policies relating to home based businesses within the Country (pages 18-20/67).

[22] The Development Authority identified that Woodbend Graminia Area Structure Plan Bylaw No. 36-2012 (the "ASP") applies to the Lands. The Development Authority indicated that the Proposed Development complies with section 4.3 of the ASP – Mixed Use / Country Residential (pages 23-24/67).

[23] The Development Authority determined that the Proposed Development was compatible with surrounding land uses on the basis that:

- a. All equipment would be stored within the existing shop, with the exception of one vehicle and one trailer carrying small equipment;
- b. Equipment repair and sale would be conducted within the existing shop; and
- c. The Applicant complies with the proposed hours of operation.

[24] In response to questions from the Board, the Development Authority stated:

- a. Any business related activities on the Lands would occur in the existing shop;
- b. If there are any complaints, County Development Services has an established enforcement procedure to determine enforcement;
- c. The main difference between a Home Based Business, Level 2 and a Home Based Business, Level 3 is that a Home Based Business Level 2 is allowed in residential subdivisions, there are no employees on the property and no outdoor storage. Customers may visit on a regular business within certain business hours such as a hair salon located within a residence. A Home Based Business Level 3 is larger in scope, with employees coming and going and implies some nuisance or off-site impact. Home Based Businesses Level 3 are not permitted within residential subdivisions; and
- d. The Applicant's original application included many elements which complied with a Home Based Business Level 2, however due to the outdoor storage it would have been a Home Based Business Level 3. As the Applicant agreed to remove outdoor storage from the Proposed Development, the Development Authority considered the Proposed Development a Home Based Business Level 2.

### **Appellant Grant Schick**

[25] Mr. Schick is a neighbouring property owner. His property is within 100 feet of the Lands.

[26] Mr. Schick disputed the characterization of the Applicant's business as small engine repairs. He stated that the Applicant repairs industrial generators with approximately 5,200 horsepower.

[27] The Applicant has the generators delivered to the Lands, where they are unloaded by forklift when necessary, and then washed with a gasoline pressure washer. The generator is then moved inside the shop to be repaired. After it is repaired, the generator is placed outside and test run for 6-8 hours.

[28] Mr. Schick said that there is generally approximately 2-3 of the generators stored outside on the Lands.

[29] As Mr. Schick is retired, he is home frequently and objected to the noise level created by the Applicant's business. He filed a complaint with the County in June 2020 regarding the noise on the Lands. He stated that the Lands have been very quiet since he filed his complaint.

[30] Mr. Schick expressed concerns regarding the wear and tear on the roads in the subdivision. Residents of the subdivision must pay for the costs of the wear and tear on the roads.

[31] Mr. Schick said he was not concerned with truck drivers in the subdivision, so long as they drove reasonably. He was concerned with the weight of the Applicant's truck with the trailer and stated that if the Applicant's truck was overloaded it could do significant damage to the roads.

[32] He also stated that as the Applicant was using his truck for a commercial purpose, he was subject to commercial driving laws and may require a Class 1 License.

[33] Mr. Schick was involved in trucking for 40 years. He questioned if the Applicant was complying with the 75% road ban on the roads when that road ban is in effect. His concern was that the Applicant was driving overweight loads which would damage the roads.

### **The Applicant – Steven Boonstra**

[34] The Applicant, Mr. Boonstra provided written and oral submissions to the Board.

[35] The Applicant and his family moved to the Lands in July of 2012. The Applicant was attracted to the area due to the excellent schools and the road being paved into the subdivision.

[36] The Applicant provides off-site repair services to other businesses and also repairs and sells generators from the existing shop on the Lands.

[37] In support of the Proposed Development, the Applicant provided the Board with a petition signed by the majority of residents of the subdivision as well as letters from residents of three lots in the Chelsea Estates subdivision and a letter from an individual who stated they were resident in the Chelsea Estates subdivision but did not identify themselves as they wished to remain anonymous.

[38] Following the receipt of a noise complaint on May 29, 2020, the Applicant made a number of changes to reduce the noise from the Lands. He planted 18 more trees in the front yard as a noise and visual barrier.

[39] The Applicant made arrangements with Latmann Equipment to perform all generator testing in Calmar shortly after he received the noise complaint. He provided a letter from Latmann Equipment supporting this arrangement.

[40] The Applicant conducted noise analysis of his pressure washer, lawn tractor, forklift and other pieces of equipment he uses for personal and business reasons. No items exceeded the 75 decibel limit in the County's bylaws.

[41] The Applicant stated that he paid higher taxes for the first few years of living in the subdivision for the paving of the road and he values the high quality of the roads in the subdivision. He provided the weights of the relevant equipment he uses and advised that for any item that exceeds the weight his personal 2-ton truck can haul, he contracts with a tow truck company and expects them to follow the relevant road bans.

[42] In response to questions from the Board, the Applicant stated:

- a. He attempted to speak to every residence in the subdivision, he was unable to speak with the residents of Lot 35 (located 4 lots away from the Proposed Development) and Lot 32 did not sign the petition (their only concern was road and equipment being hauled in and out);
- b. He typically has between 2 – 3 products on site at a given time. The majority of these products are pipe threaders which are approximately 300 – 500 pounds and between 20 inches to a couple feet long;
- c. The loudest part of repairing the products is the clean up using a pressure washer. The repair of the product takes place in the shop and is mainly done using hand tools though the Applicant may use air tools to repair some products;
- d. He generally had one customer per day on average. Occasionally there may be two or three customers who visit the Lands in one day;
- e. When the products are taken for testing in Calmar, they are generally brought back to the Lands to be sold; and
- f. The products are stored inside the shop and they fit easily into the shop. One product may be stored outside on an outdoor trailer.

### **Individuals Speaking in Opposition to the Appeal**

[43] Mr. Robert McKercher spoke in opposition to the appeal. He lives directly west and adjacent to the Lands.

[44] The shop on the Lands faces Mr. McKercher's house. If the Applicant is being noisy, Mr. McKercher hears it. He has not found the Applicant to be excessively noisy and finds any noise caused to be no louder than a lawn mower.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

[45] The Lands are located at 28, 27005 Township Road 511, and legally described as Lot 7, Block 3, Plan 7821013 Chelsea Estates, NE-1-51-27-W4

[46] The Lands are located within the CR – Country Residential District.

[47] The Proposed Development is a Home Based Business Level 2.

[48] Home Based Business Level 2 is a discretionary use in the CR District.

[49] The Proposed Development is compatible with the neighbouring uses.

[50] Mr. Schick is an affected person.

[51] Mr. McKercher is affected person.

[52] The Applicant is an affected person.

## **REASONS**

### **Jurisdiction**

[53] The Board notes that its jurisdiction is found in section 687(3) of the MGA. In making this decision, the Board has examined the provisions of the LUB and has considered the oral and written submissions made by and on behalf of the Development Authority, the Appellant and the Applicant.

- 687(3) In determining an appeal, the subdivision and development appeal board*
- (a) must act in accordance with any applicable ALSA regional plan;*
  - (a.1) must comply with any applicable land use policies;*
  - (a.2) subject to section 638, must comply with any applicable statutory plans;*
  - (a.3) subject to clause (a.4) and (d), must comply with any land use bylaw in effect;*
  - (a.4) must comply with the applicable requirements of the regulations under the Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Act respecting the location of premises described in a cannabis licence and distances between those premises and other premises;*
  - (b) must have regard to but is not bound by the subdivision and development regulations;*
  - (c) may confirm, revoke or vary the order, decision or development permit or any condition attached to any of them or make or substitute an order, decision or permit of its own;*

- (d) *may make an order or decision or issue or confirm the issue of a development permit even though the proposed development does not comply with the land use bylaw if, in its opinion,*
  - (i) *the proposed development would not*
    - (A) *unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, or*
    - (B) *materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land,*
  - and*
  - (ii) *the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for that land or building in the land use bylaw.*

## **Affected Persons**

[54] The first question the Board must determine is whether those appearing and speaking before the Board are affected persons. The Board notes that there were no objection made to those making submissions to the Board. However, the Board will address this issue in its reasons.

[55] Mr. Schick and Mr. McKercher both live in the Chelsea Estates subdivision. They are affected due to their proximity to the Proposed Development and the potential noise and traffic impacts of the Proposed Development on them.

[56] As the person whose development permit is under appeal, the Applicant is affected by this appeal.

## **Statutory Plans**

[57] The Board heard submissions from the Development Authority regarding the Proposed Development's compliance with the MDP. The Development Authority advised that the Proposed Development complies with section 5.0 of the MDP (Economic Competitiveness and Employment) in particular the policies relating to home based businesses within the Country. The Board heard no evidence contradicting these submissions and find the Proposed Development complies with the MDP.

[58] The Lands are within the Woodbend Graminia Area Structure Plan Bylaw No. 36-2012 (the "ASP"). The Development Authority advised that the Proposed Development complies with section 4.3 of the ASP – Mixed Use / Country Residential. The Board heard no evidence contradicting these submissions and find the Proposed Development complies with the ASP.

## **Land Use District**

[59] The Lands are zoned as CR – Country Residential (LUB Section 5.3)

## **What is the Use?**

[60] The Board must consider, based on the merits of the application, if the Proposed Development is a Home Based Business and if it is a Home Based Business, if it is a Home Based Business Level 2 or a Home Based Business Level 3.

[61] Under section 16.9 of the LUB, the Development Authority must review each application for a development permit to determine the type of use which the development constitutes, and is to make this determination based on the merits of the application submission:

- a. the merits of the application submission, regardless of the use applied for by the applicant;
- b. the definitions of the use as expressed within Part 6 of the LUB; and
- c. the spirit and intent of the defined use in the LUB.

[62] The Board will consider each of these elements below.

#### The Merits of the Application

[63] The Applicant lives with his family in the dwelling on the Lands.

[64] His application is for an off-site repair business with minor small equipment repair and sale from the existing shop on the Lands.

[65] The Applicant's business consists of off-site repair of equipment as well as repair and sale of generators from the Lands.

[66] The small equipment repair is the repair of generators.

[67] There is no outdoor storage permitted as part of the Proposed Development except for one commercial vehicle and trailer.

[68] There is no off-site parking required for the Proposed Development.

[69] The Applicant or his family who permanently reside in the dwelling on the Lands are the only permitted employees for the Proposed Development.

[70] The Applicant generally has only one customer a day on average.

[71] These facts were uncontested at the hearing and the Board accepts these facts as forming the merits of the Proposed Development.

#### The Definition of the Use

[72] The LUB, section 20.3 defines Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3 as follows:

<b>Home Based Business Level 2:</b>	<b>Home Based Business Level 3</b>
<p>means an occupation, trade, or craft for gain or support, and is secondary to the principal residential use. It may include some client visits and the parking of one commercial vehicle and may not include on-site employees except the resident and the resident's family who permanently reside in the dwelling. Typical secondary uses may include massage therapy, spa/esthetics services, dog grooming, landscaping/snow removal, dressmaking, hairdressing, home crafts and handicrafts, picture framing, delivery services, mobile food vendors or caterers, individual instruction to students, off-site mobile repairs and installation, janitorial services, mobile entertainment services and the carrying out of minor household appliance repair and automotive repair (does not include autobody repair).</p>	<p>means trade or craft for gain or support and is secondary to the principal residential use. A Home Based Business Level 3 includes all home based businesses not considered Home Based Businesses, Level 1 or Level 2. It must include the resident who permanently resides in the dwelling and may include up to four (4) employees who do not reside on the property. Typical secondary uses may include contractor services, parking of commercial vehicles in excess of Home Based Business Level 2, automotive and autobody repair and on-site fabrication. This use class does not include more intensive Industrial type of uses that present exterior impacts such as noise, smoke, steam, odour, dust, fumes, exhaust, vibration, heat, glare, refuse matter, and storage of hazard or combustible materials which should be located in an industrial district.</p>

[73] A key element of both a Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3 is that the use is "secondary to the principal residential use."

[74] The Board has considered the Proposed Development and finds it is a Home Based Business as the use is secondary to the principal residential use of the Lands. The Applicant resides on the Lands with his family and his use of the existing shop for his business is secondary to the principal residential use of the Lands.

[75] The Board has reviewed the definitions of Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3. The key distinction between the two use class definitions is that in a Home Based Business Level 2, no employees are permitted who do not reside on the property.

[76] A Home Based Business Level 2 allows for some customer visits and only permits the parking of one commercial vehicle. A Home Based Business Level 3 does not specify the number of customer visits permitted or the number of commercial vehicles permitted but includes all home based businesses not considered Home Based Businesses Level 1 or Level 2.

[77] The Board notes that the Applicant is the only employee who may work on-site at the Proposed Development, there is on average one customer visit per business day and only one commercial vehicle will be parked on site. These facts were undisputed at the hearing and the Board accepts them.

[78] The Board finds that the average customer visit of one customer per business day falls within "some customer visits" in the definition of Home Based Business Level 2. The Board agrees with the submission of the Development Authority that this is fewer customer visits than the example of a hairdressing or spa home based business which are examples of Home Based Business Level 2s provided in the definition in the LUB.

[79] Based on these facts, the Board finds that the Proposed Development falls within the definition of a Home Based Business Level 2.

#### The Spirit and Intent of the Defined Use

[80] The Development Authority responded to the Board's questions regarding the distinction between a Home Based Business Level 2 and a Home Based Business Level 3, stating there is a grey area between the two uses.

[81] The Board notes that the LUB, section 12.8(2) provides regulations regarding Home Based Business Level 2. The key distinctions in the regulations regarding Home Based Business Level 2 and the regulations for Home Based Business Level 3 include that the regulations for a Home Based Business Level 2 are:

- a. no outside storage of goods, materials, commodities or finished products shall be permitted;
- b. no variation from the external appearance and residential character of the land or buildings shall be permitted;
- c. the use shall not generate excessive or unacceptable increases in traffic within the neighbourhood or immediate area;
- ....
- g. the parking of one (1) commercial vehicle with one (1) accessory trailer such as dual axle gravel truck with pup, trailer carrying a small backhoe, bobcat, or similar, tractor unit only (no trailer), or a three (3) ton truck or like type vehicle may only be allowed by the Development Authority on a discretionary basis;

[82] The Board has considered the spirit and intent of the defined use of Home Based Business Level 2. The Board finds that the distinctions between a Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3 rely mainly on the impact on neighbouring parcels and the variation from the residential nature of the primary use.

[83] The Board recognizes that the Applicant's original application included outside storage. He modified the application to remove outside storage in accordance with the regulations for a Home Based Business Level 2.

[84] The Proposed Development does not include any variation in the external appearance of the existing shop and residence on the Lands. The Proposed Development, which will take place almost exclusively inside the existing shop and no changes to structures on the Lands is

proposed as part of the Proposed Development. No outdoor storage is permitted as part of the Proposed Development.

[85] The Board did not hear any evidence regarding a variation from the external appearance of the Lands or a change in the residential nature of the Lands. The Board also notes that as a condition of the development permit, the Applicant is not permitted to vary the external appearance and residential character of the Lands or buildings on the Lands.

[86] The Board heard evidence that the average number of customer visits was one per business day and accepted this evidence. One customer visit per day does not result in an unacceptable or excessive increase in traffic. Further, there is no requirement for off-site parking for customers.

[87] The Proposed Development only includes parking for one commercial vehicle with an accessory trailer which may carry a small equipment unit on it (similar to a small backhoe or bobcat).

[88] On a review of the regulations relating to a Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3 and the definitions of Home Based Business Level 2 and Home Based Business Level 3, the Board finds that Proposed Development meets the spirit and intent of the Home Based Business Level 2.

### **Nature of the Use**

[89] A Home Based Business Level 2 is a discretionary use in the CR District as set out in section 5.3.2(e) of the LUB.

[90] As the proposed development is a discretionary use, the Board must assess the compatibility of the use applied for with the neighbouring uses as referenced in *Rossdale Community League (1974) v. Edmonton (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board)*, 2009 ABCA 261.

[14] The object and purpose of a discretionary use is to allow the Development Authority to assess the particular type and character of the use involved, including its intensity and its compatibility with adjacent uses.

[91] The Appellant raised the following concerns:

- a. The noise generated by the Proposed Development; and
- b. The impact of the Proposed Development on the roads in the subdivision.

### **Noise**

[92] The Appellant raised the issue of noise caused by the Proposed Development in his written submissions. At the hearing, he identified that for the past month and a half, following

his noise complaint, the Lands have been very quiet and that he had no objection to the noise level if it continued as it currently is.

[93] The Applicant detailed the modifications he made following the noise complaint, including the testing of generators in Calmar and planting additional trees. He provided details of the noise generated by his equipment and stated it did not exceed the Community Standards Bylaw and was in line with the noise from household items such as a lawn mower.

[94] Mr. McKercher, in his letter and in his oral submissions, notes that he is adjacent to the Applicant's shop and does not find the noise excessive or to interfere with his use of his property.

[95] The letters from identified neighbors in support of the Proposed Development submitted by the Applicant also speak to the minimal impact of the Proposed Development on neighbouring properties. The Board places no weight on the anonymous letter submitted as it cannot identify how this person is affected. The Applicant made significant efforts to consult with all residents in the subdivision.

[96] The Board finds that the Proposed Development will not create excessive noise that makes it incompatible with neighbouring uses based on the following evidence:

- a. The Applicant's modification to the Lands including relocating the generator testing to an off-site location following the Appellant's noise complaints;
- b. The Applicant's evidence regarding the noise generated by his other equipment;
- c. The Appellant's evidence that the Lands have been quiet following his noise complaint (and the Applicant's relocation of the generator testing) and that he has no objections to the current noise level; and
- d. Mr. McKercher's evidence that despite being directly adjacent to the Lands, he does not find the noise to be excessive or interfere with his use of his property. The Board considers in particular that the Appellant stated that following his noise complaint the Lands have been very quiet and he has no objections.

[97] The Board accepts the above evidence and concludes that the Proposed Development is compatible with neighbouring uses from a noise perspective.

## **Road**

[98] The Appellant identified that his concern was with overweight vehicles on the road, in particular during a 75% road ban. He was not concerned with trucks driving in the subdivision so long as they drove reasonably.

[99] The Appellant did not present any evidence that the Applicant was driving overweight loads on the roads in the subdivision. The Applicant denies having done so.

[100] The Board does not regulate the weight of vehicle loads on roads. It cannot determine if the Applicant is driving overweight vehicles on County roads. It cannot determine if tow trucks that the Applicant contracts with are driving overweight vehicles on the County roads. Enforcement of any road ban and vehicle weight is with the County.

[101] The Board can review the traffic impacts of the Proposed Development. It notes that the Applicant or tow trucks he contracts with will be driving into the subdivision to deliver generators. Based on the limited number of generators onsite at a given time, the Board finds that this will be a minimal impact on neighbouring properties.

[102] The Proposed Development has a minimal level of traffic created. The Board notes that the Applicant contemplates one customer visit a day during the work week generally with a maximum number of three customer visits in a single day. The Board finds that this is a minimal increase in traffic and will have no impact on neighbouring properties or affect the use of neighbouring properties.

[103] Issued this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2020 for the Parkland County Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B. Williams', is positioned above a horizontal line.

---

B. Williams, Clerk of the SDAB on behalf of  
of J. Smith, Chair Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

*This decision may be appealed to the Court of Appeal of Alberta on a question of law or jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 688 of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26.*

**APPENDIX "A"**  
REPRESENTATIONS

**PERSON APPEARING**

---

1. Feinan Long, Development Authority
2. Karen Kormos, Supervisor, Development Planning
3. Grant Schick, Appellant
4. Steven Boonstra, Applicant
5. Tom Lippiatt, Planning Development (August 17, 2020)
6. Ken Woitt, Manager, Development and Planning (August 17, 2020)
7. Robert McKercher (August 21, 2020)

**APPENDIX "B"**  
**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE SDAB:**

Exhibit	Description	Date	Pages
1.	Agenda Package Table of Contents and Agenda	July 9, 2020	1-6
2.	Notice of Appeal	July 24, 2020	6-8
3.	Submissions of the Development Authority	August 10, 2020	9-52
4.	Submissions of the Applicant – Steven Boonstra	August 7, 2020	53-67