

**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](mailto:sdab@parklandcounty.com)

HEARING DATE: October 24, 2022  
FILE NO.: 22-D-296

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

**INTRODUCTION**

[1] The Development Authority of Parkland County (the "Development Authority") refused a development permit for dog boarding and training & construction of custom dog crates, located at Lot 4, Block 1, Plan 7720134, N-5-54-27-W4 and municipally described as 8-54029 Range Road 275 (the "Lands").

[2] John Dugas (the "Appellant") appealed the refusal of the development permit application 22-D-296.

[3] The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the "Board") heard the appeal on October 24, 2022, in person and via virtual attendance at Parkland County Council Chambers - 53109A Hwy 779, Parkland County, AB.

**PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

**A. Board Members**

[4] 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] The Chair confirmed that everyone in attendance had the full hearing package prepared for the hearing. There were no objections to any of the exhibits. The Board marked the exhibits received as set out at the end of this decision.

[6] The Development Authority did not provide their submissions by the deadline of Tuesday October 18, 2022. Mr. Dugas advised he had no objection to the Board considering the Development Authority's submissions. The Board marked the Development Authority's submissions as an exhibit.

[7] In response to a question by the Board if there was any further information to be submitted to the Board, Mr. Dugas advised he had a magazine publication from Courageous Companions which he wished to put before the Board. The Development Authority had no objections. The Board marked Mr. Dugas's submissions as an exhibit.

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

### **C. Miscellaneous**

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

[10] The Board is satisfied that it has jurisdiction to deal with this matter. There were no objections to the proposed hearing process.

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

[11] The Board allows the appeal in part and grants the Appellant a development permit for a Kennel (Boarding and Training of Medical Service Dogs) and Accessory Use (Custom Dog Crate Construction) with the following conditions:

- a. The proposed development shall conform to the Site Plan submitted to the Development Authority (Appendix "C") and shall not be moved, altered, or enlarged except where authorized or directed through this permit approval.
- b. The Lands must be fenced as shown in the Site Plan. Access to the Lands from the roadway must be gated.
- c. The parking lot shown in the Site Plan shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.
- d. The Kennel may only be used for the boarding and training of medical service dogs or dogs being trained as medical service dogs.
- e. A maximum of 8 dogs may be on the Lands for boarding or training as medical service dogs at one time, and does not include personally owned dogs in accordance with Parkland County's Animal Control Bylaw.
- f. Failure to comply with the conditions of this permit may result in the permit being cancelled and or revoked.

### **Permit Notes**

1. An approved development permit means that the proposed development has been reviewed only against the provisions of the Parkland County Land Use Bylaw. It does not remove obligations to conform with other legislation, bylaws, land title instruments, safety codes regulations, and any caveats, covenants, or easements that might affect this Property.

[12] The Board upholds the refusal of the Development Authority in respect of obedience training of dogs generally.

## **SUMMARY OF HEARING**

[13] The following is a summary of the oral and written evidence and arguments 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**

[14] On March 18, 2022, the Development Authority received a development permit application for dog boarding and training & construction of custom dog crates from the Appellant. The Development Authority deemed the application complete on August 26, 2022.

[15] The Lands are within the CR - Country Residential District of the Parkland County Land Use Bylaw (the "LUB") and are within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision as defined in the LUB.

[16] In reviewing the application, the Development Authority determined that the proposed development meets the listed definition for Kennel as per Section 20.3 of the LUB as the proposed development will be used for boarding and training of dogs. The proposed development operations were described in the development permit application as:

1. One on One Obedience Training: 2-3 clients per week
2. Medical Service Dog Training: Up to 6 dogs at one time would be housed on site for 3-12 months
3. Service Dog Boarding & Training: Up to 3 dogs per month for 30 days or longer.
4. Custom Dog Crates: Build custom wooden dog crates.
5. Total number of dogs on site at one time: 8-12 dogs

[17] The Development Authority determined that the proposed development did not meet the requirements of a Home Based Business Level 2 as the scope and scale of the proposed development would not be secondary to the principal residential use. The outdoor training of dogs is not consistent with the requirements of a Home Based Business Level 2 and dogs barking has the potential to generate noise excessive or offensive to neighbours.

[18] The Development Authority noted that a Home Based Business Level 2 should comply with the requirements of the Animal Control Bylaw. The Animal Control Bylaw limits a residential parcel to 4 dogs.

[19] A Kennel is a discretionary use in the CR – Country Residential District.

[20] Section 12.9 of LUB provides Specific Use Regulations for Kennels. As per Section 12.9.1 a Kennel shall not be within or adjacent to a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[21] On September 2, 2022, the Development Authority refused the development permit application as the Lands are within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[22] The Development Authority identified that there have been two complaints to the County regarding the Lands to date regarding the number of dogs on the Lands and dogs at large.

[23] In response to questions from the Board, the Development Authority advised that the Development Authority was of the opinion that the Board has authority under s. 687(3)(d) of the MGA to allow for the proposed development in a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision as Section 12.9.1 is a Specific Use Regulation and not a Fundamental Use Regulation (which the Board cannot vary).

### **Appellant John Dugas**

[24] The Appellant John Dugas provided the Board a description of his certifications in working with dogs, specifically medical service dogs and his involvement in the service dog community. The Appellant operates Holdfast K9. Holdfast K9 has been approved by the Government of Alberta to provide medical service dog training.

[25] The Appellant trains, rehabilitates and boards medical service dogs. Medical service dog training can range from 3-12 months of training onsite. Rehabilitation of medical service dogs will be on the lower end (3 months) and is used for medical service dogs that have experienced a difficulty during their work and require rehabilitation to allow them to continue to work as a medical service dog. The Appellant provided an example of a medical service dog who was assaulted by a member of the public and now requires rehabilitation before they can work again.

[26] The Appellant stated the medical service dogs cannot be boarded at a typical kenneling facility when their owner is unable to be with them (such as when an owner is hospitalized for an extended period of time) as a typical kennel facility is too stressful for these types of dogs. As such, they must be boarded in a residential environment.

[27] Medical service dog training is very distinct from a typical kennel operation. Medical service dogs are trained to assist their owners with various medical issues. They are not kept in caged runs like a typical kennel, but rather spend most of their time in a home environment for their training. Some of the dogs will sleep in indoor crates at night, most will sleep in a bedroom with the Appellant as part of their training may involve waking up their owners or turning on lights.

[28] The dogs spend between 1-2 hours a day outside being exercised. The Appellant has an agreement with the neighbouring parcel owner to the north to run the dogs using a quad on his 144 acre parcel. The younger dogs which cannot be run using a quad will be exercised in a fenced area as shown on the Site Plan (Appendix "C").

[29] Due to the cost associated with a medical service dog (between \$20,000-30,000), the dogs are not left unattended or unobserved outside. The Appellant stated that he is

constructing a 4-5 foot Page Wire fence around the Lands in order to keep the dogs on the Lands and to protect the dogs from predators. Access to the Lands from the roadway is controlled using a powered gate. The Appellant stated that the powered gate was taken out by his movers but he is working to have this addressed.

[30] Medical service dogs are not generally barking dogs. Some dogs may need to be trained to bark on command and the Appellant acknowledged there will be some barking from the dogs. The Appellant stated that barking is strictly controlled and monitored. The Appellant stated that he was aware that neighbours would attribute any barking in the subdivision to his dogs. He stated he had a video (which was not provided to the Board) where neighbourhood dogs were barking and his dogs were outside not barking.

[31] Medical service dogs are trained to be in public and around people. The Appellant stated that even if a medical service dog in training or being boarded got loose, it should not pose a threat to any member of the public.

[32] The Appellant stated that obedience training was a minimal part of Holdfast K9's business, between 3-4 clients a month. The Appellant acknowledges that dogs in obedience training may have barking issues which a client could be bringing the dog to Holdfast K9 to address.

[33] The proposed development will have parking on site as shown in the Site Plan (Appendix "C"). The Appellant stated that as such, there will be no impact on parking in the neighbourhood. The Appellant stated that dog waste is cleaned up daily on the Lands and will not become a nuisance.

[34] The Appellant stated that the construction of custom wooden dog crates is a very small part of his business and is client specific. It does not involve the use of commercial woodworking equipment and will take place entirely within the detached garage on the Lands.

### **In Opposition to the Appeal– Colin and Tina Schneider**

[35] Colin and Tina Schneider submitted an email to the Board. The Schneider's were not in attendance at the appeal. They live adjacent to the Lands.

[36] The Schneider's object to the proposed development on the basis that:

1. The LUB and CR – Country Residential District do not typically allow for a dog boarding kennel.
2. The proposed development would decrease the value of neighbouring properties.
3. The proposed development poses an increased risk to the health, safety, and well-being of the neighbouring properties and residents.

[37] The Schneider's submit that a Kennel is typically reserved for industrial use zoned lands. The Lands are within a country residential subdivision with individual lots approximately 3-4 acres in size. If a Kennel is allowed on the Lands, in fairness, all parcels in the subdivision

should be allowed to keep an increased number of dogs which is neither practical nor desirable. As such, the Lands are not suitable for a Kennel.

[38] The Schneider's note that current County regulations limit the number of dogs per parcel. For the Lands the limit would be 4 dogs. The proposed development would exceed the allowable number of dogs on the Lands.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

[39] The Lands are located at Lot 4, Block 1, Plan 7720134, N5-54-27-W4 and municipally described as 8-54029 Range Road 275.

[40] The Lands are located within the CR - Country Residential District of the LUB and are within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[41] The use of the proposed development is Kennel with an Accessory Use.

[42] The Appellant is an affected person.

[43] Colin and Tina Schneider are affected people.

## **REASONS**

### **Jurisdiction**

[44] 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 the parties.

*687(3) In determining an appeal, the subdivision and development appeal board*

*...*

- (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.*

[45] The Board notes that the Schneiders and the Development Authority have raised the Animal Control Bylaw No. 2015-09 (the "Animal Control Bylaw") which limits the number of dogs per parcel in Parkland County. The Board does not have authority in respect of the Animal Control Bylaw. This decision does not override any provisions of the Animal Control Bylaw and only addresses the development permit process within the LUB.

### **Affected Persons**

[46] The first question the Board must determine is whether those individuals who made written submissions and appeared before the Board are affected persons. The Board notes that no party raised any objection with any other party's participation.

[47] As the person who applied for the development permit, the Appellant is affected by this appeal.

[48] Colin and Tina Schneider reside adjacent to the Lands. Based on their proximity to the proposed development, the Board finds that the Schneiders are affected persons.

### **Issues to be Decided**

#### **The Board must determine**

[49] Is the proposed development in compliance with the applicable statutory plans?

1. What is the use of the proposed development?
2. Is the use discretionary?
3. If so, is the use compatible with the surrounding uses?
4. Can and should the Board exercise its variance power under s. 687(3)(d) to allow for a Kennel in a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision?

### **Statutory Plans**

[50] The only evidence before the Board on the applicable Municipal Development Plan Bylaw 2017-14 (the "MDP") is the information from the Development Authority. The Lands are within the Country Residential Area of the MDP Development Concept. The Board heard no evidence that suggests that the proposed development is not in compliance with the MDP.

[51] The Lands are within the Atim Creek Area Structure Plan. The Board heard no evidence that suggests that the proposed development is not in compliance with the Atim Creek Area Structure Plan.

### **Land Use District**

[52] The Lands are zoned as CR - Country Residential.

### **Nature of The Use**

[53] The Board finds that the nature of the use is that of a Kennel with an Accessory Use of custom dog crate construction.

[54] The LUB defines a Kennel as follows:

Kennel means development used for the breeding, boarding, caring or training of dogs.

[55] The proposed development included the boarding and training of dogs, and as such, it is a Kennel. The Board appreciates the Appellant's comments that the proposed development is not a typical kennel operation due to the unique nature of medical service dog training and boarding, however, based on the broad definition of "Kennel" in the LUB, the Board finds that Kennel is the appropriate use classification.

[56] The Board finds the custom dog crate construction is accessory to the Kennel based on the Appellant's submissions that this was a very small part of the business and was client specific. Accessory uses for discretionary uses in the CR – Country Residential District are also discretionary.

### **Compatibility**

[57] A Kennel is a discretionary use in the CR – Country Residential District. As such, the Board must consider if it is compatible with the neighboring uses (*Rossdale Community League (1974) v. Edmonton (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board)*, 2009 ABCA 261 at para 14). In determining compatibility, the Board has considered the issues raised by the Schneiders in respect of compatibility between the proposed development and the neighbouring uses.

[58] The Board has considered the Schneiders' submission that Kennels are typically found in an industrial area. The Board notes that a Kennel is a discretionary use within the CR – Country Residential District. The Board must consider if a Kennel is compatible with the neighbouring uses as it is a discretionary use in the CR – Country Residential District, even if Kennels are typically found in industrial areas.

[59] The Board notes that the Appellant has an agreement with the owner of the parcel to the north to "run" the dogs on the 144-acre parcel. The Board finds this agreement supports compatibility between the proposed development and the adjacent uses on the northern parcel.

[60] The Board finds that the proposed development is compatible with the neighbouring residential uses in the subdivision as it is distinct from a typical kennel operation. Service dogs are being trained for a residential environment. They are not kept in outdoor runs or cages. The medical service dogs live in the home with the Appellant as part of their training. These dogs are trained not to bark except where they may need to alert their owner.

[61] The Board notes the evidence from the Development Authority that the Lands had been subject to two complaints to date regarding a dog at large and the number of dogs on the Lands. The Board accepts the submission of the Appellant that the fencing proposed in the Site Plan (Appendix "C") will address any concern regarding a dog at large in the subdivision. In respect of the number of dogs on the Lands, the Board would condition any development permit on a limited number of medical service dogs or dogs in training to be medical service dogs which may be trained or boarded on the Lands to a limit of 8 dogs. The Board finds that this condition will address concerned raised regarding compatibility.

[62] Due to the unique nature of the proposed development as training and boarding for medical service dogs in a residential setting and the proposed fencing, the Board finds that the proposed development is compatible with the neighbouring uses in the subdivision.

[63] The Board does not find that obedience training for dogs generally is compatible with the neighboring residential uses. As stated by the Appellant, owners bring dogs with behavior problems for obedience training and these behavior problems may include excessive barking.

[64] The obedience training portion of the proposed development is not compatible with neighboring uses as it may result in excessive barking and brings dogs with behavioral issues into the subdivision. As such, the Board upholds the Development Authority's refusal of the development permit application in respect of the obedience training in the proposed development.

[65] The Board considered the Schneiders' submission that the proposed development would decrease the value of neighbouring properties. The Schneiders' provided no evidence to the Board in support of this submission. The Board considered the Appellant's submission that barking is strictly controlled from medical service dogs and that there are other dogs within the subdivision which bark. Parking for the proposed development is provided onsite and will not impact parking in the subdivision.

[66] The Board finds that the impacts from the proposed development are contained on site. Although some noise can be expected from barking, the Board finds it will not be excessive and accepts the submission from the Appellant that barking from medical service dogs is strictly controlled. As noted above, the Board has limited the number of medical service dogs which may be on the Lands for training or boarding to 8 and required that the Lands be fenced. The

Board finds that these mitigations will significantly reduce any potential impact on neighbouring properties. As a result, the Board finds that the proposed development will not decrease the value of neighbouring properties.

[67] The Board considered the Schneiders' submission that the proposed development poses an increased risk to the health, safety and well-being of the neighbouring properties and residents. The Schneiders' provided no evidence to the Board in support of this submission. The Board notes that above, it has rejected the portion of the proposed development for obedience training for dogs, as such, the only dogs at issue are medical service dogs.

[68] The Board accepts the submission from the Appellant that medical service dogs do not pose a risk to the public and are not aggressive. Medical service dogs are trained to be in public with their owners. The Board accepts the submission from the Appellant that when the Lands will be fenced and this will ensure that no dog gets loose from the Lands. The Board would condition any approval on fencing as set out in the Site Plan (Appendix "C"). As such, the Board finds that the proposed development will not pose an increased risk to the health, safety and well-being of the neighbouring properties and residents.

[69] Accessory uses for discretionary uses in the CR – Country Residential District are also discretionary. As such, the Board must consider if the custom dog crate construction is compatible with the neighboring uses. The Board finds it is as:

1. The construction will take place entirely indoors in the detached garage on the Lands; and
2. The construction does not involve significant woodworking or the use of industrial woodworking tools;

the custom dog crate construction is compatible with the neighboring residential uses.

### **Variance Test – s. 687(3)(d) of the *Municipal Government Act***

[70] The Specific Use Regulations for Kennels in the LUB states:

A Kennel shall not be within, adjacent to, or closer than 300.0 m from the boundary of a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision (LUB, s. 12.9.1)

[71] The Lands are within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[72] The Board finds that it has authority to vary the Specific Use Regulation in respect of locating a Kennel within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision. Section 12.9.1 is not a Fundamental Use Provision of the LUB. It is found under the heading "Specific Use Regulation".

As noted by the Development Authority, this is within the scope of the Board's authority to vary pursuant to s. 687(3)(d).

[73] The CR- Country Residential District provides for Fundamental Use Provisions at s. 5.3.2 which states "The Fundamental Use Provisions as requisite qualifiers for Permitted and Discretionary Uses listed". This list includes identification of uses which shall not be in a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision. This list does not include a Kennel and a Kennel is a listed discretionary use in the CR – Country Residential District. As such, the Board finds that the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for the Lands and the Board must consider if it should vary the regulation in respect of the location within a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[74] The variance power of the Board is set out in s. 687(3)(d) of the MGA which provides:

*(3) In determining an appeal, the board hearing the appeal referred to in subsection (1)*

*...*

*(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 neighborhood, or*

*(B) materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighboring parcels of land, and*

*(ii) the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for that land or building in the land use bylaw.*

[75] In the Board's view, the language of section 687 is intended to grant broad authority to the Board to consider and grant variances. As the Court of Appeal noted in *Edmonton (City of) Library Board v Edmonton (City of)*, 2021 ABCA 355 (CanLII) at paras 46-47:

*Section 687(3)(d) gives an appeal board wide discretion in deciding whether the negative effects condition has been met as confirmed by language such as "may", "in its opinion", "unduly" and "materially"...*

*...that power is not limited to cases of undue hardship or unique or minor situations.*

[76] The Board agrees that the qualifying language of "unduly interfere" and "materially interfere" in s. 687(3)(d) suggests that a variance can be granted even if a proposed development has some impact on the amenities of the neighborhood, or some impact of the use, enjoyment, or value of neighboring lands. The test is intended to be flexible enough for the Board to manage the legislative objective of balancing the private interests of landowners to develop, with those of the community and adjacent neighbors. Most development will have some effect on neighboring parcels and the test must not be applied so strictly so as to stymie development completely.

#### Use, Enjoyment and Value of Neighbouring Parcels

[77] The Board has addressed the submissions of the Schneiders' regarding their use, enjoyment and value of their lands above in its reasons regarding compatibility. The Board finds

that the training and boarding of medical service dogs is a unique use which will not have many of the negative impacts associated with a typical kennel. The Board notes that it has rejected the portion of the proposed development relating to general obedience training and imposed a limit on the number of medical service dogs which may be trained or boarded on the Lands to minimize impacts on neighboring parcels.

[78] The Board notes that the Appellant identified that neighboring parcels have dogs which bark more frequently than the medical service dogs he trains. There will be some effects from the proposed development, such as some barking, but the Board does not find these impacts will materially impact the use, enjoyment and value of neighboring parcels in a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

[79] The majority of impacts of the proposed development will be wholly contained on the Lands. Parking for the proposed development is provided entirely on the Lands. The medical service dogs will be trained and exercised on the Lands (and the parcel to the north). The medical service dogs are not left outside unattended or unsupervised. Each medical service dog will be on the Lands for between 3-12 months for training. As such, the Board is satisfied it should vary s. 12.9.1 of the LUB to allow for the proposed development in a Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivision.

## **Conclusion**

[80] Having considered the evidence and argument before it, the Board is satisfied that the appeal should be allowed in part. For these reasons, the Board allows the appeal in part and grants the development permit for a Kennel (Boarding and Training of Medical Service Dogs) and Accessory Use (Custom Dog Crate Construction) with the following conditions:

- a. The proposed development shall conform to the Site Plan submitted to the Development Authority (Appendix "C") and shall not be moved, altered or enlarged except where authorized or directed through this permit approval.
- b. The Lands must be fenced as shown in the Site Plan. Access to the Lands from the roadway must be gated.
- c. The parking lot shown in the Site Plan shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.
- d. The Kennel may only be used for the boarding and training of medical service dogs or dogs being trained as medical service dogs.
- e. A maximum of 8 dogs may be on the Lands for boarding or training as medical service dogs at one time, and does not include personally owned dogs in accordance with Parkland County's Animal Control Bylaw.
- f. Failure to comply with the conditions of this permit may result in the permit being cancelled and or revoked.

## Permit Notes

1. An approved development permit means that the proposed development has been reviewed only against the provisions of the Parkland County Land Use Bylaw. It does not remove obligations to conform with other legislation, bylaws, land title instruments, safety codes regulations, and any caveats, covenants, or easements that might affect this Property.

[81] Issued this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2022 for the Parkland County Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.



---

Barb Williams, Clerk of the SDAB, on behalf of B. Bundt, 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

**PERSONS APPEARING**

---

1. Seghan MacDonald, Development Authority
2. John Dugas, Appellant

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

<b>October 24, 2022 Agenda Package</b>			
Exhibit	Description	Date	Pages
1.	Agenda Coversheet	NA	1
2.	Table of Contents	NA	2
3.	Notice of Appeal	September 13, 2022	3-4
4.	Hearing Notification	September 22, 2022	5-6
5.	Submission in Opposition of the Appeal	September 27, 2022	7-9
6.	Development Authority Submissions – Received during the hearing	October 14, 2022	n/a
7.	Appellant Submissions – Received during the hearing	October 24, 2022	n/a

**APPENDIX "C"**  
**SITE PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT/APPELLANT**

