

**SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
PARKLAND COUNTY**

Legislative Services, Parkland County Centre
53109A HWY 779
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1
Telephone: (780) 968-8471
Email: SDAB@parklandcounty.com

HEARING DATE: August 22, 2022
FILE NO.: 22-D-071

Notice of Decision of Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

INTRODUCTION

[1] The Development Authority of Parkland County (the "Development Authority") refused a development permit application for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution located at NW-11-53-26-W4 municipally described as 11721 Bevington Road, Acheson, Parkland County (the "Lands").

[2] On July 12, 2022, David Schoor of ISL Engineering (the agent for the owner - the "Appellant") appealed the refusal of the development permit application 22-D-071.

[3] The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the "Board") heard the appeal on August 22, 2022 in person.

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.

B. Exhibits

[5] At the beginning of the hearing, the Chair asked if everyone in attendance had the hearing package prepared for the hearing. All parties indicated that they had received the package and had no objections. No one in attendance sought to put in materials for the Board's consideration that were not part of the Agenda Package.

[6] There was no request for an adjournment of the hearing.

C. Miscellaneous

[7] There were no objections to the proposed hearing process.

DECISION OF THE SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD

[8] The Board denies the appeal.

SUMMARY OF HEARING

Summary of Development Authority's Submissions

[9] ISL Engineering, David Schoor, appealed the decision of the Development Authority of Parkland County to refuse a development permit application made by Harry Little (on behalf of 1773536 AB Ltd.) to establish a "waterworks and precast supply company. Product range from fire hydrants to PVC & concrete pipe". The Lands are located at 11721 Bevington Road, legally described as Pt of NW-11-53- 26-W4M. The Lands are located directly south of Highway 16, in the northeast portion of the Acheson industrial area.

[10] The Development Authority reviewed the application and issued a refusal on the grounds that it does not comply with the County's Land Use Bylaw 2017-18, (the "LUB"). The Development Authority submits that the refusal be upheld and this appeal be dismissed.

A. Municipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 2017-14 (the "MDP")

[11] The Lands are within a Major Employment Area as identified in the MDP Development Concept.

B. Area Structure Plan ("ASP")

[12] The Lands are governed by the Acheson Industrial ASP, which identifies the lands as Commercial/Light Industrial and subject to the Acheson Industrial Frontage Overlay.

[13] ASP Policy 2.4.4 identifies that Light Industrial developments are characterized by higher quality building and site design standards.

[14] ASP Policy 2.4.5 identifies that general industrial uses shall be located away from Provincial highways and major roadways. These developments are characterized by extensive outdoor storage. Typical "Industrial" uses have nuisances that extend beyond the building envelope, for example, extensive product warehousing and storage facilities. These uses are to be located in the areas identified as "Industrial" in the ASP Development Concept.

[15] ASP Policies 2.6.1 through to 2.6.3 outline requirements for development along highway corridors and establishes guiding policy for the Industrial Frontage Overlay.

[16] The Appellant is appealing the decision of the Development Authority in refusing a Development Permit for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor on the Lands. The application for "waterworks and precast supply company. Product range from fire hydrants to PVC & concrete pipe" was deemed complete by the Parkland County Development Authority on April 4, 2022.

C. Land Use Bylaw No. 2017-18

[17] The following items were submitted in support of the application:

- a. Application Form
- b. Land Title
- c. General Description of Business
- d. Site Plan
- e. Building Floor Plans
- f. Photos of Existing Building and existing Quonset

[18] The Lands are located within the BI – Business Industrial District and, due to proximity to Provincial Highway 16, are within the Industrial Frontage Overlay as described in the LUB. Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor is not a listed use (neither permitted nor discretionary) within the Industrial Frontage Overlay.

[19] The Development Authority completed a thorough review of the application against the LUB and determined that the proposed activities on the Lands meet the definition for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor as defined in Section 20.3 of the LUB.

[20] In making its decision, the Development Authority took into consideration the following:

- a. Site Plan and Floor Plans
- b. Description of Business
- c. Defined Uses and Terms in LUB.

[21] The Development Authority did review the proposed development against the listed definition for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor as set out in Section 20.3 of the LUB.

Storage Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor means a development primarily used for indoor storage and distribution of raw materials, partially processed and finished goods, and related equipment. This use class does not preclude activities associated with the shipping/loading of materials from occurring outdoors.

[22] In the opinion of the Development Authority, the proposed development did not meet the definition of Storage Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor, as the general business description supplied with the application, the submitted site plan and floor plans demonstrate that the principal use of the site is not indoor storage. For instance, the floor plans submitted identify approximately 3,856 ft² of indoor storage, display and office space (Note: The Development Authority did not include outdoor deck space in calculation). The site plan, when compared with aerial photography, show a proposed yard site of approximately 65,000 ft². This means that the structures, if used entirely for indoor storage, only account for 6% of the site.

[23] Further, no description was given regarding the activities occurring within the storage yard that would lead the Development Authority to understand that it is only to be used for the "shipping/loading of materials".

[24] Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor means a development primarily used for outdoor storage and distribution of raw materials, partially processed and finished goods, and related equipment. It is the opinion of the Development Authority that the application and submitted drawings more closely align with the listed definition for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor, as the proposed storage activities occur primarily outdoors.

[25] This use class is not a listed use within the Industrial Frontage Overlay. Therefore, the Development Authority was unable to approve the development and the permit was refused.

[26] The Development Authority advised the Board that if its decision is overturned, development within the Acheson Industrial Area is to be fully serviced by municipal water and sewer servicing as outlined by both the LUB and Acheson Industrial ASP.

- a. LUB.
 - i. The BI-Business Industrial District purpose statement (s 7.1.1) identifies that the district is to be used in fully serviced business and industrial parks.

- b. Acheson Industrial ASP
 - i. Policy 4.2.6 of the Acheson Industrial ASP requires that all parcels districted for industrial and commercial uses under the Land Use Bylaw shall be serviced by full municipal water, sewer and shallow utility servicing.

 - ii. Policy 4.2.7 states that when existing developments serviced by on-site systems wish to expand, subdivide or change uses, the developer will be required to connect to the County's water and sewer systems are within close proximity of the parcel as determined by Parkland County.

[27] The Development Authority submitted that the SDAB should uphold the decision of the Development Authority because the proposed development meets the definition of *Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor*, which is not an allowable use on the Lands as set out in Section 10.4.2 of the LUB.

[28] In response to Board questions:

- a. concerning the other businesses located along Highway 16, the Development Authority advised that of the eight other properties along the highway, six of them obtained their development approval before 2019, the date that the Industrial Frontage Overlay came into place. Of the properties referenced by the Appellant, only one received permit approval after 2019 and one is not in conformance. Therefore, this property is different from the other properties.

- b. the Development Authority stated that the property located at #302 (see page 77 of the Agenda Package) is different in that it has a substantial building on the site. There is a different percentage of indoor versus outdoor storage. The Development Authority stated that it attempts to work with businesses to determine if they are manufacturing indoors. If the business is manufacturing in

the building and placing the product outdoors, the overlay tries to prevent outdoor laydown yards near the highway.

- c. the Development Authority stated that section 13 of the Land Use Bylaw contained the regulations applicable to the landscaping for business industrial uses. The section contains details based upon the frontage adjacent to the roadway. There would be a calculation of total frontage for a six meter buffer. Section 13 speaks to the number of trees and shrubs and a mix of coniferous and deciduous trees. The LUB does not speak to screening or fencing. If screening was required, likely slatted fencing with trees would be acceptable. It is generally up to the Development Authority to make a determination and consultation with an applicant about the nature of the screening. The Development Authority considers any site constraints for the placement of trees, for example rights of way. However, there is no specific fencing requirements for the form and character of the fence.

The Appellant

[29] Mr. Schor of ISL Engineering spoke on behalf of the Appellant owner. He started his presentation by referencing page 62 of the Agenda Package and stating he would be speaking to:

- a. The site location;
- b. Similar uses and developments;
- c. The application and decision;
- d. The industrial frontage overlay; and
- e. Statutory plan (MDP and ASP)

[30] The summary of the Appellant's position is that the proposed development is compatible and conforms to the uses and the neighbouring uses. The County documents provide sufficient flexibility to approve the development if the Board wishes to do so. In referencing page 63 of the Agenda Package, the Appellant outlined that the Lands are located near Highway 16 with two access routes: one to Highway 60 to the west and one to Highway 261. There is limited access to the Lands. The lands to the east of the red arrow shown on page 63 are undeveloped. The lands to the west along the highway form a one kilometer row of commercial and industrial businesses that have outdoor storage.

[31] The Appellant provided the Board with an overview of slides 64 through 73. The Appellant referenced other businesses along the highway which the Appellant argued contain a similar use to that applied for by the Appellant. The Appellant specifically referred to page 71 and the Fabco business which has a very similar business to that of the Appellant. The Appellant argued that all eight neighbouring properties operate a business industrial use. They all contain fabricated buildings. They all have little to no landscaping and they are all screened or have chain link fencing. The Appellant submitted that these similar uses are placed together and the intention of the County's LUB is to ensure compatibility of uses, limit nuisances and to provide certainty. The Appellant stated that the Appellant's business is the same as the others referenced at pages 64 to 73 of the Agenda Package. The Appellant questioned why the development permit was refused, if its use was similar to those other uses.

[32] The Appellant referred to Page 35 of the Agenda Package indicating that the building on the Lands includes meeting spaces to host client meetings and product representatives. The Appellant stores product in the white Quonset building and outside the building. This is similar to the eight buildings in the examples referenced by the Appellant. At page 74 of the Agenda Package, the Appellant has provided a letter setting out the nature of the business. It is a local business which sells hydrants and water and sewer pipes. The Appellant stated that 75% of the product from the Appellant's business never reaches the site, going directly to the construction sites. Twenty-five percent of the product comes to the Lands. The Appellant stated that typically less than the current amount of storage occurs on the Lands.

[33] The Appellant stated that it has the support of its neighbours, including Fabco, its closest neighbour.

[34] The Appellant stated that the red outline at page 77 of the Agenda Package shows the office and the quonset. Product is stored outside, but manufacturing is done inside and outside of the Quonset. Only 15% of the Lands are used for storage and display. There is a display of product along the fence to the north. The remainder of the Lands is used for drive aisles for the product to be loaded. The Appellant argued that all of the activity is allowed within indoor use and that the use allows the outdoor display and storage of product.

[35] The Appellant argued that the Development Officer did not ask the Appellant about storage when making its decision.

[36] In referring to section 10.4 from the industrial frontage overlay (page 78 of the Agenda Package), the Appellant argued that the purpose of the industrial frontage overlay was not to prevent outdoor shipping or loading. The Appellant argued that all businesses in that location along the highway have a similar use. The Appellant argued that the development meets the intent of the overlay and is compatible with the adjacent uses. The development has a nice appearance and contributes to the growth in the County.

[37] The Appellant argued that the overlay contains no metric about how much storage must be inside or outside. The definition just says "primarily" which allows the Development Authority or the SDAB to be flexible. The overlay gives the SDAB the discretion. In referencing section 10.4.3 and 10.4.4 of the LUB, the Appellant noted that section 10.4.3 provides that outdoor storage is to be adequately screened. While the Appellant was not asked for screening, it is prepared to do so. If landscaping or screening is required as a condition to approve the development, the Appellant will supply it.

[38] The Appellant argued that the proposed development conforms to the County's MDP and ASP. In relation to the MDP, the land use concept identifies this as a "major employment area". The proposed development meets the requirements as a commercial light industrial. The Appellant argued that it conformed to section 5.0.6.b.

[39] Page 81 of the Agenda Package contains an excerpt from the Acheson Industrial Area ASP. Policy 4 references that this is a light industrial area. The Appellant stated that the development is a high quality building and has the appropriate site standards.

[40] In response to Board questions, the Appellant stated that the Lands are privately serviced at this time. When they were originally subdivided, the services were not tied to the Lands. Mr. Little, the principal of the Appellant, stated that he had been there thirty years and there were no services to the Lands. He stated there are no stubs to tie into the County's servicing. Therefore, servicing will not be as straight forward as connecting to an existing stub. He stated that services are located in the neighbour's drive and are located thirty feet underground. He stated that he is going to try to get underground power. He is currently looking at how to tie into municipal services. He will be meeting with the mayor next week to determine if there is a way to do so. His connection to municipal services would require him to shut down his neighbour's operations and would also cost well over \$100,000 to tie in.

[41] In response to Board questions:

- a. about how much of the product is stored inside, the Appellant stated that the site is intended to have products stored as shown in the aerial photograph at page 77 of the Agenda Package. Only about 15% of the site is used for storage and the balance is to allow the product to be packaged for shipping.
- b. the Appellant stated that it is willing to connect to municipal services. Mr. Little stated that he is in the process of determining what is required with a goal to connect to municipal services. He is attempting to determine how that connection can occur without shutting down his neighbours.
- c. about the 15 % storage and how that percentage was determined, the Appellant stated that it did not obtain a survey. Rather it took the aerial shown at page 77 and then did an analysis of the area as compared to what was shown on that photograph.
- d. about the percentage of indoor storage versus outdoor storage, the Appellant stated that the building contains storage area opportunities on the main and second floor as indicated by the Development Authority. There is some storage in the Quonset. The Appellant did not do a calculation of the amount of storage inside versus outside, but saw the definition as indicating that a percentage of the site is used for storage and the percentage of the site, in the Appellant's view, is low. The Appellant argued that the majority of the business is done inside where the deals occur for the product. The Appellant stated that small fittings are contained within the building. The Quonset stores hydrants. Pipes are stored outside. Their direct competitor is Fabco, located to the west, which also stores pipe outdoors.
- e. about whether a condition limiting the amount of storage to 15% would be acceptable, the Appellant argued that it would be. Mr. Little stated that usually there would be less outdoor storage, but due to supply chain issues which are currently a problem, there is more. He stated that a 15% limitation would be acceptable to the Appellant.
- f. about the percentage of materials stored on site and whether it is manufactured on site, the Appellant stated that the manufacturing is done on site within the

Quonset. There is a coring of pipe to different diameters. This represents a percentage of the twenty-five percent of product that comes to the site. The Appellant argued that Fabco does not do manufacturing on site.

- g. about potential conditions about screening or landscaping, the Appellant stated that they had not had a discussion about the volume or location of screening and fencing. The Appellant stated that there is a stand of trees to the north of the building which are mature and the trees provide screening when driving to the east. With regard to landscaping on the other part of the Lands, Mr. Little is prepared to install landscaping.

FINDINGS OF FACT

[42] In addition to the specific facts set out under the Board's reasons, the Board finds the following as facts.

[43] The Lands are located at NW-11-53-26-W4M, municipally described as 11721 Bevington Road, Acheson, Parkland County.

[44] The Lands are located within the BI- Business Industrial District.

[45] The Lands are located within the Industrial Frontage Overlay contained within the LUB.

[46] The Development Authority refused development permit application on June 21, 2022.

[47] The use on the Lands is Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor.

[48] Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor is neither a permitted use or a discretionary use in the Industrial Frontage Overlay.

[49] The appeal was filed July 12, 2022.

[50] The Appellant is an affected person.

REASONS

[51] 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, the MDP and the ASP and has considered the oral and written submissions made by and on behalf of those who provided evidence: the Development Authority and the Appellant.

Affected Persons

[52] The first question the Board must determine is whether those appearing and speaking before the Board are affected. The Board notes that no party raised any objection with any other party's participation.

[53] The Appellant filed an appeal from the refusal of its development permit application. As the Appellant's development permit refusal is under appeal, the Board finds that the Appellant is an affected person.

Issues To Be Decided

[54] In its decision, the Board must determine:

- a. What is the nature of the use which is the subject of the development permit application?
- b. Is the use permitted by the Industrial Frontage Overlay as defined in section 10.4.1 of the LUB?
- c. If so, does the proposed development comply with the provisions of the County's statutory plans (MDP and ASP)?

What is the nature of the use which is the subject of the development permit application?

[55] The first question for the Board to decide is what is the nature of the use that is the subject of the development permit application. The Development Authority identified that the proposed development could be one of two potential uses. The uses could be either Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor or Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor. The two definitions are set out below.

STORAGE, WAREHOUSING, AND DISTRIBUTION, INDOOR means a development primarily used for indoor storage and distribution of raw materials, partially processed and finished goods, and related equipment. This use class does not preclude activities associated with the shipping/loading of materials from occurring outdoors.

STORAGE, WAREHOUSING, AND DISTRIBUTION, OUTDOOR means a development primarily used for outdoor storage and distribution of raw materials, partially processed and finished goods, and related equipment. This use may include a security suite as defined by this Bylaw.

[56] The Development Authority submitted that based upon its analysis of the facts, the use was Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor. The Development Authority's analysis was based upon its assessment of the amount of storage available within the buildings as compared to the amount of storage which could occur outdoors. The Development Authority determined that there was approximately 3,856 ft² of indoor storage space from both the office as well as the Quonset. The potential storage space outdoors was approximately 65,000 ft². On that basis, the Development Authority argued that the use was predominantly outdoor storage.

[57] In contrast, the Appellant argued that 75% of the goods which were part of the development did not come to the Lands. Of the 25% remaining, the Appellant stated that 15% of the yard was used for outdoor storage. The Appellant also argued that the definition of Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor did not preclude outdoor storage. The Appellant urged the Board to find that the definition was flexible enough to encompass the proposed use.

[58] In coming to its determination as to whether the proposed development is Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor or Outdoor, the Board notes that the difference between the two definitions is specifically in relation to whether the development is *primarily* used for indoor storage or outdoor storage. There is no definition in the LUB for the word "primarily". Therefore, the Board must make a determination as to whether the definition of Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Indoor is broad enough to encompass the facts set out in this appeal.

[59] In conducting its analysis, the Board is aware that its interpretation of the LUB will require it to conduct a purposive analysis.¹ This purposive analysis requires the Board to interpret the words of the LUB in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the LUB, the object of the LUB and the intention of Council, as the body passing the LUB.

[60] The Board notes that the word "primarily" suggests that something more than fifty percent would be required to establish that the storage is Indoor. The Board draws the conclusion that the word "primarily" means "the majority" because of the plain meaning of "primarily" - something used for the most part, as can be seen from the Merriam Webster online definition², the definition of primarily means "for the most part or chiefly".

[61] The Board notes that the word "primarily" used for storage and distribution could be interpreted in one of two ways:

- a. It could be interpreted in reference to the volume of sales or business from the proposed development; or
- b. It could be interpreted in relation to the amount of area over which the storage and distribution on the Lands takes place.

[62] In order to come to a determination as to which interpretation falls within the purposive interpretation, the Board has first examined the two definitions contained within the LUB. Both definitions speak of a development and its indoor/outdoor storage and distribution of raw materials, partial processed and finished good and related equipment. The definition does not contain any express reference to the volume of business occurring on the property that would aid in a construction of the word "primarily" that references the percentage of business conducted indoors versus outdoors.

[63] The Board has also examined the purpose of the industrial frontage overlay found at section 10.4 of the LUB (page 22 of the Agenda Package). The purpose is as follows:

The purpose of this Overlay is to elevate the Highway corridor experience in a major employment area and establish an area of compatibility for industrial, commercial, office, and retail activities. The Industrial Frontage Overlay area contains Parcels with high-visibility from major Highway. The Industrial Frontage Overlay area will have

¹ Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd (RE) 1978 [1] SCR 127.

² Definition of primarily <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/primarily>

1: for the most part : CHIEFLY

2: in the first place : ORIGINALLY

buildings and sites that are of a high aesthetic standard, contributing positively to the general corridor area, and encouraging diverse economic growth.

[64] The Board notes that the purpose of the Overlay is to elevate the highway corridor experience. The purpose statement references parcels with high visibility from a major highway and speaks to a high esthetic standard. In the face of this purpose statement, the Board has considered whether the intention of the definitions is to capture the volume of business, or to capture the percentage of the land area covered by outdoor storage.

[65] In coming to its conclusion on this question, the Board concludes that the intention of the word primarily contained within the definition is a reference to site area because of the purpose statement which deals with the visibility of parcels from a highway and the express reference to a high esthetic standard. The Board does recognize that that the preamble references the encouragement of diverse economic growth, but the Board concludes that the intention must be to land area for the following reasons.

[66] A Development Authority, and upon appeal, the Board, would be able to make a determination as to whether the land area is primarily used for storage based upon an assessment of square footage. It would be a much more difficult task for a Development Authority or for the Board to make this determination based upon value. The Board can easily count the square footage of the buildings on the site and the square footage of the land area of the development site. It is unclear how one would calculate the value of business which occurred through the office located on the Lands or the value of goods that were shipped directly to a customer location and which did not end up on the Lands. It would be difficult to make an assessment as to whether higher valued goods were brought to site or shipped directly to customers' sites or to make any assessment about whether higher value goods were stored inside as compared to outside. The Board is of the view that the intention of the drafters of the LUB was to make the determination and calculation of "primarily" to be as simple as possible for the determiner. The Board has determined that the assessment required to determine whether the Lands are used "primarily" for indoor or outdoor storage has to be on the square footage of the Lands as it meets the reference to esthetic standards and it is relatively easily calculable. Further, the Board considered the Appellant's statement that 75% of the goods are not shipped to site. However, there was no value attributed to the goods shipped to customer's sites as compared to those not shipped to customer's sites.

[67] Based upon the Board's assessment that the determination is based on the amount of land and whether the storage is primarily indoors, the Board proceeded to consider whether the evidence before it supported a finding of fact that the use was primarily indoor storage. In coming to its conclusion, the Board noted that the total area of the Lands is 65,000 ft². The uncontroverted evidence was that the indoor storage both from the Quonset and the office building was only approximately 3,600 ft². The Board accepted the Appellant's comments that only 15% of the Lands were used for outdoor storage. Even accepting this determination, the Board notes that 15% of 65,000 ft² is 9,750 ft². The amount of outdoor storage is still three times the amount of available indoor storage. The Board notes that three times the outdoor storage to indoor storage leads to a conclusion that the use is outdoor storage.

[68] The Board also notes that of the 25% of total amount goods which are to be placed on the Lands (both inside and outside), the Appellant did not provide any specific percentages of

what amount of the 25% would be stored inside the buildings and what percentage would be stored outside the buildings. Therefore, the Board is left to make this determination based upon the amounts the Appellant stated would be stored outside. The Board concludes as a matter of fact that the amount of storage outdoors is three times the amount of storage that would be indoors. The definition of indoor storage requires the majority of storage to be indoors. The facts, as found by the Board, lead the Board to conclude that the storage is outdoor storage.

Is The Use Permitted Or Discretionary Within The Land Use Bylaw?

[69] Under the Industrial Frontage Overlay, Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, indoor is a permitted use. Storage, warehousing and distribution, Outdoor is neither permitted nor discretionary.

[70] Having determined as a fact that the use is Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor, the Board cannot approve the use as that use neither permitted nor discretionary in the Industrial Frontage Overlay District. The Board has no authority to vary use (section 687(3)(a.3). Since the Board cannot approve the use, it must refuse the development permit and deny the appeal.

[71] As a result of the above decision, the Board does not need to determine whether the proposed development complies with the County’s statutory plans because the Board cannot approve the use.

Conclusion

[72] For the above reasons, the Board finds that the development is for Storage, Warehousing and Distribution, Outdoor. This use is neither permitted nor discretionary within the district and the Board denies the appeal.

[73] Issued this 2nd day of September, 2022 for the Parkland County Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.



B. Williams, Clerk of the SDAB, on behalf of D. 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. Rachelle Trovato, Development Authority, Parkland County
2. David Schoor, ISL Engineering and Land Service
3. Harry Little, Appellant

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

| August 22, 2022 Agenda Package | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------|
| Exhibit | Exhibit | Exhibit | Exhibit |
| 1. | Agenda Coversheet | August 18, 2022 | 1 |
| 2. | Table of Contents | August 18, 2022 | 2 |
| 3. | Notice of Appeal – David Schoor, Agent: ISL Engineering and Land Services | July 12, 2022 | 5 |
| 4. | Submission of the Development Authority | August 16, 2022 | 6-60 |
| 5. | Submission of the Appellant – David Schoor, Agent: ISL Engineering and Land Services | August 16, 2022 | 61-82 |