

**SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD  
PARKLAND COUNTY**

Legislative Services, Parkland County Centre  
53109A HWY 779  
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1  
Telephone: (780) 968-8471  
Fax: (780) 968-8413

HEARING DATE: November 4, 2019  
FILE NO.: 19-D-379

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

**INTRODUCTION**

[1] The Development Authority of Parkland County (the "County") approved a development permit application made by Dean and Christine Burghardt (the "Applicants") to relocate a single wide mobile home to Lot 8, Block 1, Plan 752MC (the "Site").

[2] Dan and Kelly Stewart, Trevor Duke, Tammy and Stacy Switzer and Kathy and Mark Murray (the "Appellants") appealed the issuance of development permit 19-D-379 (the "Development Permit").<sup>1</sup>

**PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

**A. Board Members**

[3] At the start of the hearing, the Board asked if anyone had an objection to the panel hearing the appeal. There were no objections raised regarding the panel members.

**B. Exhibits**

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

**C. Miscellaneous**

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

[6] 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appeal was filed by Kelly Stewart on behalf of 12 individuals. The clerk of the SDAB contacted all of the listed individuals on the Notice of Appeal and five individuals requested they be removed as Appellants. Only Kelly Stewart and Dan Stewart attended the Hearing. None of the Appellants provided written submissions in addition to the Notice of Appeal.

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

[7] The Board denies the appeal and confirms the Development Permit with the conditions imposed by the Development Authority. The Development Permit is issued subject to the following conditions:

- a. The proposed development shall conform to the stamped approved plans and shall not be moved, altered or enlarged except where authorized or directed through this permit approval.
- b. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall provide a security deposit in the amount of \$1500.00 for the construction of the approach. The approach must be built to comply with Parkland County's Engineering Design Standard, to the satisfaction of the Development Authority in consultation with Land Development Engineering.
- c. Any modifications, renovations or improvements shall be completed within 120 days of the relocation of the structure (or in a timely fashion as determined by the Development Authority.)
- d. Any proposed changes shall first be submitted for review by the Development Authority. Any changes considered substantial or inconsistent with this approval, as determined by the Development Authority, may require separate development permit approval.
- e. Failure to comply with the conditions of this permit may result in the permit being cancelled and or revoked.
- f. The applicant shall remove all garbage and waste at their own expense and keep the site in a neat and orderly manner.

### **PERMIT NOTES:**

1. The applicant is responsible to ensure compliance with the Alberta Wildlife Act and the Migratory Birds Convention Act.
2. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that all property approaches are designed and constructed in accordance with Parkland County's Engineering Design Standards. For more information on approach requirements, contact Land Development Engineering at 780-968-8443.

3. The applicant is responsible to obtain building, plumbing, electrical, gas and private sewage permits which may be required. Permits must be obtained from Parkland County.

4. It is the applicant's responsibility to contact Alberta One-Call at 1-800-242-344 7 before any ground disturbance.

## **SUMMARY OF HEARING**

[8] 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**

[9] The Site is located within the LSR Lakeshore Residential District.

[10] The Applicants submitted an application to the Development Authority to relocate a 2006, mobile home – 16' by 56' (the "Mobile Home") to the Site on September 10, 2019. The Development Authority approved the application with conditions on September 25, 2019.

[11] The Development Authority determined the use class of the proposed development to be a Manufactured Home, Single Wide. The use of Manufactured Home, Single Wide is a discretionary use in accordance with section 5.8 of Land Use Bylaw 2017-18, ("LUB").

[12] The development permit application did not require any variance of the setback requirements for the Lakeshore Residential District.

[13] As the development permit application was to relocate a previously owned building, the Development Authority considered the visual compatibility of the development with the existing uses pursuant to section 11.7.3 of the LUB which provides:

11.7.3 The Development Authority shall not approve a development permit for a relocated previously owned building or structure unless it is designed, constructed, sited, finished and clad in a manner that is visually compatible, in the opinion of the Development Authority, with the existing residential dwelling, single detached, manufactured home or accessory building, lands and the neighbourhood in general.

[14] The Development Authority reviewed the colour photographs of the Mobile Home submitted as part of the development permit application. It determined that the Mobile Home was well maintained and in excellent condition.

[15] The Development Authority determined that the Mobile Home was visually compatible as its construction used the same materials as are used to construct a stick built home.

[16] The Development Authority noted section 12.11.2 of the LUB which provides that:

12.11.2 A Manufactured Home, Single Wide shall only be allowed to locate in the following locations designated acceptable for manufactured home placement and use:

...

b) Within "resort/lakefront" Multi-Parcel Residential Subdivisions where the majority of Parcel sizes are less than 1,858.0 m<sup>2</sup>;

[17] The Development Authority concluded that the proposed development complies with section 12.11.2 of the LUB as it is located in a resort/lakefront subdivision and the largest lot in the Mattwa Bay subdivision is 858.8 m<sup>2</sup>.

[18] The Development Authority further noted that the Site is quite narrow, at only 18.29 m wide, which limits the size of a dwelling that may be built or moved onto the Site. The setbacks in the Lakeshore Residential District are 6.0 m on each side for parcels where the side yard is adjacent to municipal reserve, environmental reserve, lakeshore, or internal subdivision road.

[19] The Site is subject to the Municipal Development Plan, Bylaw No. 2017-14 (the "MDP"). The Development Authority submitted that the proposed use was consistent with the MDP as it encourages residential development that meets varied house and lifestyle needs.

[20] The Site is not subject to an area structure plan.

[21] The Site is within the Wabamun Lake Environmentally Significant Area (the "ESA") as defined in the County's Environment Conservation Master Plan (the "ECMP"). The Development Authority submitted that the proposed use did not conflict with the ECMP as the proposed development is not considered a major development and would have little to no effect on the ESA.

[22] The Development Authority determined that the proposed use was appropriate for the Site and the surrounding area, subject to the conditions set out in the development permit (Exhibit 1, pages 11-12):

#### Response to questions from the Board

[23] In response to questions from the Board, the Development Authority explained that the deck depicted in the site plan submitted by the Applicants (Exhibit 1, pages 27 and 36) is not included in the development permit. A deck which is less than 2 feet high does not require a development permit under the LUB. As such, the Development Authority did not consider the deck in determining whether the proposed development met the setback requirements.

[24] The Development Authority clarified that if the Applicants applied to construct a stick built home the setbacks requirements would be the same.

[25] The Development Authority considered that there was another Manufactured Home, Single Wide use in an adjacent small subdivision that is on the lakefront and that the provisions of the LUB support the use of a Manufactured Home, Single Wide on the Site.

[26] In response to questions from the Board, the Development Authority clarified that the LUB did not regulate the number of fifth wheel trailers or recreational vehicles on a parcel.

## **Appellants**

[27] After hearing from Kelly and Dan Stewart, the Board understood the location of each Appellants' residence to be as follows from the map located at Exhibit 1, page 39:

- a. Kelly and Dan Stewart – Lot 3A on Township Road 530;
- b. Trevor Duke, Tammy Switzer and Stacy Switzer – Lot 1 on Township Road 530;  
and;
- c. Kathy Murphy and Mark Murphy – Lot 2 on Township Road 530.

### Appellants – Kelly and Dan Stewart

[28] Kelly and Dan Stewart are located on the same street as the proposed development. Mr. Stewart has owned his property for 25 years and lived in it fulltime for several years. Now, Mr. and Ms. Stewart go back and forth between their property in Mattwa Bay and a property in St. Albert.

[29] Kelly and Dan Stewart identified three major concerns with the proposed development:

- a. Property Value
- b. Aesthetics, and
- c. Parking.

### *Property Value*

[30] The Stewart's stated their major concern with the Mobile Home is the impact on their property value due to the stigma of a mobile home. Dan Stewart stated that Dean Burghardt has done a great job making the Site look nice. Mr. Stewart stated that the Site is a tough place to build due to the setbacks and the width of the Site but he believes that the Applicants could apply for a variance and build a larger home on the Site.

[31] He stated that his concern was not with the Applicants but rather with any future owners. The neighbourhood would be "stuck" with a mobile home on the Site.

[32] Mr. Stewart stated that placing a mobile home next to a nice permanent home will depress the value of the properties in the Mattwa Bay subdivision. He asked that the Board protect the long-term investment of homeowners in the Mattwa Bay subdivision.

### *Aesthetics*

[33] In response to questions from the Board, Mr. and Ms. Stewart explained that the following developments are located on the following lots in the Mattwa Bay subdivision as shown in Exhibit 1, page 39:

- a. Lot 1: Permanent structure with extensive renovations.
- b. Lot 2: Old cabin which has had extensive renovations to keep it useable as an old cabin. The owners plan to tear down the cabin and build a permanent structure as their retirement home.
- c. Lot 3A (the Stewart's property): 3,500 sq foot house with a large garage. Mr. Stewart purchased the property 25 years ago and has done extensive renovations including adding the garage. They are redesigning the house and want to undertake further renovations to the house.
- d. Lot 4: A permanent structure and a garage with a suite over it.
- e. Lot 5: A triple bay garage. Not used as a residence.
- f. Lot 6: Older cabin. The owners own Lot 7 as well. They are planning to either sell Lot 6 or tear down the cabin and build on Lot 6 and 7.
- g. Lot 7: No structure.
- h. Lot 9: Large log cabin.

[34] Ms. Stewart stated that the proposed development is not a lake style home and that the Applicants should build something more appropriate for lake style living. She stated that the Applicants using their recreational vehicles and campers on the Site is more consistent with lake style living than the Mobile Home.

[35] In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Stewart clarified that lake style homes are rustic style of home with a higher peaked roof. He noted Mattwa Bay is an older subdivision with no building guidelines. He stated that there are older shacks and cabins and there may well be modular homes in the area. He stated that the appropriate place for a mobile home is an acreage or somewhere with more privacy.

[36] Mr. Stewart noted that there is vinyl siding on the Mobile Home. He objected to the vinyl siding. However, he noted that two of the homes in Mattwa Bay have vinyl siding. He explained that one of the two houses is a large home and the other is a small cabin which is double the width of the Mobile Home but shorter.

[37] Ms. Stewart objected to the location placement of the Mobile Home on the Site. The Mobile Home is shown on the site plan as situated in the middle of the Site and it will be very visible to the subdivision. Mr. Stewart noted that they objected to a mobile home being placed in the subdivision altogether but that if it was allowed, he would be agreeable to an easement or allowance to allow the Applicants to place it further back on the Site.

[38] In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Stewart clarified that the difference between a park model home and a mobile home is that there are park model homes which can be architecturally pleasing with variation in the roof line. Ms. Stewart noted that a nice park

model home can cost from \$100,000 to \$150,000. She stated that the value of the Mobile Home is \$15,000 and that represents a big difference in aesthetics.

### *Parking*

[39] Ms. Stewart noted that they are concerned that the placement of the Mobile Home in the middle of the Site will leave no room for parking. They are concerned that there will be no room for the Applicants or visitors to park on the Site and they will park on the roads around the Site.

### **Applicants – Dean and Christine Burghardt**

[40] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt purchased the Site in 2016. They stated that they have taken the Site from an undeveloped vacant mud pit to a presentable, relaxing vacation spot. They want to enjoy the Site year-round with their friends and family. Due to the setbacks in the Lakeshore Residential District and the size of the Site, they feel a Manufactured Home, Single Wide is their most feasible option.

[41] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt submitted that the Mobile Home is in immaculate condition. They provided photos to show the condition of the Mobile Home and advised they would put skirting around the home as soon as possible (Exhibit 1, page 34). The Burghardt's have a conditional offer on the Mobile Home. The Burghardt's dispute Ms. Stewart's statement that the mobile home cost \$15,000, and stated that the building is valued above \$15,000.

[42] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt consulted with the County on the possibility of a variance on the Site. The County advised them that since the Site was next to municipal reserves, a variance would not be considered.

[43] The Site is 18.29 m wide. The required setbacks in the LUB for the Site are 6 m on each side, leaving 6.29 m of building space. Mr. and Ms. Burghardt felt the best option to comply with the setback requirements would be a Manufactured Home, Single Wide.

[44] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt noted that there is a manufactured home in the adjacent Prowse Park subdivision (Lot 11 identified in Exhibit 1, page 39). They note that Prowse Park has significantly higher average property values than Mattwa Bay and the highest assessed property value in Prowse Park is significantly higher than the highest assessed property value in Mattwa Bay. As such, they believe that their Mobile Home will not affect the resale value of surrounding properties.

[45] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt stated that lakeshore living is a diverse community with many different housing types. They noted that one of the parcels in Mattwa Bay is a storage garage owned by a non-resident of Mattwa Bay.

[46] They also noted that there are no restrictive covenants on the Site and no architectural guidelines that are required for their development on the Site.

[47] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt noted that the Site will have parking available for two recreational vehicles along the west side of the Site and there will be ample passenger vehicle parking to the front and east of the Mobile Home.

[48] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt identified that section 12.11 of the LUB provides that Manufactured Homes can only be located in specific areas designated acceptable for their use. Section 12.11.2(b) of the LUB identifies that "resort/lakefront" Multi-parcel Residential Subdivisions where the majority of parcel sizes are less than 1858.0 m<sup>2</sup> are designated acceptable for the use of Manufactured Home, Single Wide. The largest parcel in Mattwa Bay is 853.8 m<sup>2</sup>.

#### Questions from the Board

[49] In response to questions from the Board, Mr. and Ms. Burghardt clarified that the deck they included in their site plan would be under two feet high. Even taking into account the deck, Mr. and Ms. Burghardt stated they will have room to the west and north side of the Mobile Home for parking.

[50] Mr. and Ms. Burghardt stated that they have planted grass and a flower bed on the Site. They intend to do more landscaping in front of the Mobile Home for aesthetics.

[51] Mr. Burghardt confirmed the photograph at Exhibit 1, page 34 is the Mobile Home that they will place on the Site.

[52] The Board asked Mr. and Ms. Burghardt about the compatibility of the Mobile Home with neighboring uses. Mr. Burghardt stated that he understood from his neighbours that they did not appreciate the Burghardts using a fifth wheel on the Site. He believed that the Mobile Home would be better as it would be a more permanent structure and they could use it year round.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

[53] The Site is located at 11, 5412 Township Road 530, legally described as Plan 752MC, Block 1, Lot 8. The proposed development is located in the Mattwa Bay subdivision.

[54] The Mattwa Bay subdivision is a "resort/lakefront" multi-parcel residential subdivision.

[55] The average parcel size in the Mattwa Bay subdivision is less than 1,858 sq m.

[56] The Site is zoned LSR Lakeshore Residential District.

[57] The use of Manufactured Home, Single Wide is discretionary in accordance with section 5.8 of the LUB.

[58] The Appellants are affected persons.

[59] The Applicants are affected persons.

[60] The Mobile Home is visually compatible with the neighborhood.

## REASONS

### Jurisdiction

[61] 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 as well as considered the oral and written submissions made by the Development Authority, the Appellants and the Applicants.

*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

[62] The first question the Board must determine is whether those appearing and speaking before the Board are affected persons. The Board notes that there was no objection made to

any of the speakers or Appellants on the basis that they were not affected. However, the Board will address this issue in its reasons.

[63] The Appellants all live within the Mattwa Bay subdivision and on the same street as the Site. The Board finds that due to their proximity to the Site, they are affected by the decision of the Development Authority to issue the development permit.

[64] The Applicants, Dean and Christine Burghardt, are the applicants for the permit and as such are affected by the appeal.

### **Statutory Plans**

[65] The Board heard submissions from the Development Authority that the proposed use was generally consistent with the relevant statutory documents as defined in the MGA. None of the Appellants or the Applicants provided further evidence to contradict the submissions of the Development Authority on this point. The only evidence before the Board was that the development complied with the statutory plans.

[66] Therefore, the Board finds the proposed development is consistent with the MDP as it encourages residential development that meets varied house and lifestyle needs. The Site is not subject to an area structure plan. The Board finds that there is no conflict with the proposed development.

### **Land Use District**

[67] The Site is zoned as Lakeshore Residential District (LUB section 5.8).

### **Nature of Use**

[68] The Board finds the proposed use is for Manufactured Home, Single Wide. The Board finds this use to be explicitly included as a discretionary use in the Lakeshore Residential District. The Board finds that the Mattwa Bay subdivision is a "resort/lakefront" multi-parcel residential subdivision where the largest parcel is 858.8 m<sup>2</sup>. As such, the Board finds the requirements of section 12.11.2 of the LUB are met.

[69] As the use 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.

[70] The Board also notes that as the Mobile Home is a relocated previously owned building, it must consider if it is visually compatible with the existing residential dwelling, single detached manufactured home or accessory building, lands and the neighbourhood in general pursuant to section 11.7.3 of the LUB.

[71] In its submissions, the Development Authority stated that it considered the compatibility of the development and found that it was reasonably appropriate for Site. As this was a hearing *de novo*, meaning afresh, the Board will now turn its analysis of the concerns raised in the hearing to assess whether the proposed use is compatible with the neighbouring uses.

[72] The Appellants raised the following concerns:

- a. Property Value
- b. Aesthetics, and
- c. Parking.

### **Property Value**

[73] Mr. and Ms. Stewart stated they were concerned about the impact of the Mobile Home on their property values. They stated that manufactured homes carry a stigma with them. The Appellants in their Notice of Appeal note concerns regarding the impact of the Mobile Home on their property values.

[74] However, the Appellants did not provide any evidence in support of this argument. There was no property appraisal evidence or evidence from a person qualified to provide an opinion about the impact on property value in the area. While the Board accepts the statements of concern from the Appellants, it is not persuaded by them in the absence of evidence from an appraiser or other valuator. Based on the lack of evidence, the Board does not find that the Mobile Home will have a negative impact on property values.

### **Aesthetics**

[75] The Board has reviewed the photographs of the Mobile Home. The Board finds the Manufactured Home, Single Wide to be in good condition, attractive looking and of an appropriate size for the Site. The Board finds that the use of the Mobile Home is compatible with the neighbouring uses in the Mattwa Bay subdivision and visually compatible with the Mattwa Bay subdivision.

[76] The Board accepts the evidence of the Development Authority that the Mobile Home is constructed from the same material as a stick-built home. The Board notes that the Mr. Stewart stated that two other residences in Mattwa Bay use vinyl siding and that the Mobile Home has vinyl siding. The Board finds the construction material is visually compatible with the neighbouring buildings.

[77] The Appellants submitted that a mobile home is not suitable for "lakeside living". The Appellants noted that there is a storage garage and two older cabins on three of the eight parcels in Mattwa Bay. The adjacent subdivision of Prowse Park, which is also lakefront, contains a manufactured home.

[78] The Board accepts the evidence from the Applicants and the Appellants that there are a variety of uses in the Mattwa Bay subdivision, including a storage garage, older cabins and newer residences. The Board finds there is not a consistent type of structure or use in the Mattwa Bay subdivision.

[79] The Mattwa Bay subdivision is an older subdivision with no specific architectural requirements of the buildings which may be constructed on each parcel. Mr. Stewart stated that lake style living has rustic homes with higher roof pitches and architectural interest. The Board notes that there is no evidence before them of the roof pitches or architectural interest of the existing buildings in the Mattwa Bay subdivision. No photographs have been presented by the Appellants to the Board showing the aesthetics of the surrounding buildings to show that the Mobile Home is not visually compatible.

[80] The Board has reviewed the photographs of the Site and the Mobile Home. The Board finds the Mobile Home is aesthetically consistent with the Mattwa Bay subdivision. The Mobile Home is an attractive residence in good condition. The evidence before the Board shows that it is an appropriate size for the Site and would be aesthetically pleasing on the Site.

[81] The Board has considered the compatibility of the Site without the Mobile Home. The Site currently has a shed located on it and the Applicants will park a fifth wheel trailer. The Board finds that the Mobile Home will increase the Site's visual compatibility with the neighbourhood as the Mobile Home is a more permanent structure on the Site that can be used as a residence year-round. The use of the Mobile Home as a year-round residence is consistent with the neighbouring uses in the Mattwa Bay subdivision.

[82] The Board notes that Mr. Stewart stated that there were intentions on the part of other owners in the Mattwa Bay subdivision to remove the older cabins and place larger residences on their parcels. However, the Board has no evidence from those parcel owners of their intentions, and they did not appear before the Board. The Board makes decisions regarding compatibility based on what is on the parcel currently.

[83] The Board also notes the size of the Site. As the Site is narrow, there is a limited area in which any dwelling, stick construction or mobile home, could be placed. The Board finds that the placement of the Mobile Home in the middle of the Site in accordance with the setbacks in the LUB does not prevent the Mobile Home from being visually compatible with the neighbourhood. The Board accepts the Mobile Home will be visible from the roadway. However, in light of the Board's findings regarding the aesthetics of the Mobile Home the Board finds that the visibility has no impact on the compatibility of the proposed use with neighbouring uses.

[84] Based on the evidence before it, that there are two older cabins and a storage garage as well as residences in Mattwa Bay and the photographs of the Mobile Home and the Site, the Board finds that the Mobile Home is compatible with these varying uses and is visually compatible with the neighbourhood in general.

## **Parking**

[85] The Board has considered the comments in the Notice of Appeal and from Mr. and Ms. Stewart regarding parking. The Board notes that the proposed development is a single Manufactured Home, Single Wide. The development permit permits the placement of a single residence, the Mobile Home, on the Site. The Board further notes the Development Authority's

response to questions that there is no regulation in the LUB on the number of fifth wheel trailers on a parcel.

[86] The Board is satisfied by the Applicants responses to questions regarding the availability of parking on the Site. In particular, the Board notes that the Applicants can park up to two recreational vehicles on the Site and additional passenger vehicles.

[87] The Board finds that the Mobile Home will not result in an intensification of the use of the Site as the Applicants noted that they intend to use this as a permanent structure instead of their fifth wheel trailer. There is no evidence there will be additional users of the Site due to the Mobile Home. Therefore, the Board finds that the Mobile Home will not interfere with the neighbouring uses due to parking.

[88] Issued this 12<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2019 for the Parkland County Subdivision and Development Appeal Board



---

Barb Williams, Board Clerk, on behalf of  
Larry Niblock, 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. Kim Kozak, Development Officer
2. Kelly Stewart, Appellant
3. Dan Stewart, Appellant
4. Dean Burghardt, Applicant
5. Christine Burghardt, Applicant

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

Exhibit	Description	Date	Pages
1.	Agenda Package Table of Contents and Agenda	October 31, 2019	n/a
2.	Notice of Appeal	October 16, 2019	5-6
3.	Submission of the Development Authority	October 28, 2019	7-31
4.	Submission of the Applicant Dean & Christine Burghardt	October 25, 2019	32-43