SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD

AGENDA

DATE: **Wednesday, October 2, 2024**
TIME: **6:00 p.m.**
PLACE: Council Gallery, 3rd flr, St. Albert Place
FILE: B02

---

1. Adoption of Agenda

2. Radius Notifications

3. Appeal

a) 177 Redwing Wynd

The Appellant is appealing a decision of the Development Officer in refusing a Development Permit application to construct a three-season sunroom addition.

b) 19 Kandlewick Close

The Appellant is appealing a decision of the Development Officer in refusing a Development Permit application to widen a driveway.

4. Adjournment

ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS

CITY OF ST. ALBERT

SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD DECISION
SDAB #LEG00970 - 2024

Re: PLAN 2222383; BLOCK 11; LOT 31 - known municipally as 177 Redwing Wynd, St. Albert, AB.

Regarding the appeal of a decision of the Development Officer in refusing a development permit application to construct a sunroom addition.

The Appellant had no objection to the members of this Board hearing and deciding this Appeal.

Also, none of the members of the Board identified a conflict that would prevent them from hearing this Appeal.

The Board considered the Development Officer's written report and heard from the Development Officer who stated that:

The Appellant is appealing the refusal of a development permit application to construct a sunroom addition. The maximum lot coverage on this lot is 47%. The proposed sunroom addition would result in a lot coverage of 49.7%. In accordance with Section 3.14(2)(a), the Development Officer cannot vary lot coverage.

Additionally, the sunroom addition is required to be located a minimum of 6.0m from the rear property line. The proposed rear yard setback is 4.747m. A variance of 1.25m or 20.8% is required which is within the capacity of the Development Officer to grant, however the permit cannot approve and refuse items on the same permit. This variance is also before the Board for decision.

The Development Officer also noted that the area behind the Appellants property was zoned for low density development which includes multiple family townhomes.

It may interest the Board to note the following:
Maximum lot coverage: 47%
Proposed lot coverage; 49.7%
Variance required: 2.7%

Required rear yard setback: 6.0m
Proposed rear yard setback:4.747m
Variance required: 1.25m or 20.8%

If the Board approves the appeal, the following conditions should be noted on the decision:

Conditions:

1. Development Permit approval is issued for the construction of a sunroom addition.
2. Variances are granted to relax the lot coverage and rear yard setback.
3. The lot coverage shall be permitted by SDAB at 49.7%.
4. The rear yard setback shall be permitted by SDAB at 4.747m.
5. The sunroom shall be constructed in accordance with approved site plan.
6. The sunroom height shall not exceed 11.0m.
7. Any proposed changes in design, elevation or site plan configuration shall first be submitted for review by the Development Officer and any such changes shall not be undertaken until written authorization is provided by the Development Officer.
8. The exterior finishes must match or compliment the existing house.
9. The exterior finishes must be completed within two (2) years of the date of the development permit.

Notes:

a) A person applying for, or in possession of, a valid development permit is not relieved from full responsibility for ascertaining and complying with or carrying out development in accordance with the conditions of any covenant, caveat, easement, or other instrument affecting the building or land.

b) The applicant shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws, regulations, and standards, as well as ensuring compliance with, and be responsible for obtaining, all applicable permits, licenses, and approvals, at its own expense.

c) All construction must conform to the relevant requirements of the Alberta Building Code, the City of St. Albert municipal engineering standards and all applicable codes, laws, regulations, and standards.

d) The City of St. Albert does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the city. If you are concerned about the suitability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of St. Albert, in issuing this development permit, makes no representations and offers no warranties as to the suitability of the property for any purpose or as to the presence or absence of any environmental contaminants on or within the property.

e) The city property on or adjacent to development including, but not limited to; the existing sidewalk, curb and boulevard features shall be protected from damage throughout the construction process. Damage caused by the owner, builder, tradesman, or suppliers shall be repaired to the satisfaction of the City of St. Albert Engineering Services. An inspection of the existing site conditions must be completed by city staff prior to commencement of the work. All snow and debris shall be removed from the sidewalk areas for the inspection. If necessary, a city

representative will contact the applicant and request the site be cleared for inspection, prior to demolition and commencement of construction.

The Board heard from the Appellants who stated that:

The Appellants want to build a three-season aluminum screened-in area on their existing deck. It will not be serviced. It is also a temporary structure; in that it is not permanently attached to the house.

They indicated that their back yard faces due east and the sun prohibits them from fully using their deck. The properties on either side are relatively close and adding the three-season room to their deck will provide further privacy and allow them to use and enjoy their deck.

The Board also considered/reviewed the following

There were no submissions received from any party within the radius notification area that were opposed to the variance.

The Appellants indicated that they contacted their adjacent neighbours and they were in favour of the variance.

The Board finds the following:

Allowed with conditions:

Conditions:

1. Development Permit approval is issued for the construction of a sunroom addition.
2. Variances are granted to relax the lot coverage and rear yard setback.
3. The lot coverage shall be permitted by SDAB at 49.7%.
4. The rear yard setback shall be permitted by SDAB at 4.747m
5. The sunroom shall be constructed in accordance with approved site plan.
6. The sunroom height shall not exceed 11.0m.
7. Any proposed changes in design, elevation or site plan configuration shall first be submitted for review by the Development Officer and any such changes shall not be undertaken until written authorization is provided by the Development Officer.
8. The exterior finishes must match or compliment the existing house.
9. The exterior finishes must be completed within two (2) years of the date of the development permit.

Notes:

a) A person applying for, or in possession of, a valid development permit is not relieved from full responsibility for ascertaining and complying with or carrying out development

in accordance with the conditions of any covenant, caveat, easement, or other instrument affecting the building or land.

b) The applicant shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws, regulations, and standards, as well as ensuring compliance with, and be responsible for obtaining, all applicable permits, licenses, and approvals, at its own expense.

c) All construction must conform to the relevant requirements of the Alberta Building Code, the City of St. Albert municipal engineering standards and all applicable codes, laws, regulations, and standards.

d) The City of St. Albert does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the city. If you are concerned about the suitability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of St. Albert, in issuing this development permit, makes no representations and offers no warranties as to the suitability of the property for any purpose or as to the presence or absence of any environmental contaminants on or within the property.

e) The city property on or adjacent to development including, but not limited to; the existing sidewalk, curb and boulevard features shall be protected from damage throughout the construction process. Damage caused by the owner, builder, tradesman, or suppliers shall be repaired to the satisfaction of the City of St. Albert Engineering Services. An inspection of the existing site conditions must be completed by city staff prior to commencement of the work. All snow and debris shall be removed from the sidewalk areas for the inspection. If necessary, a city representative will contact the applicant and request the site be cleared for inspection, prior to demolition and commencement of construction.

The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board of the City of St. Albert hereby grants the Appeal to construct a sunroom addition located at **177 Redwing Wynd, St. Albert, AB.**

The Board makes its decision for the following reasons:

1. The Board concludes that (in accordance with section 687(3)(d) of the *Municipal Government Act*) the variance will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, and/or materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land based on the following because:

    a. The most affected neighbours were consulted and no objections were received with respect to the variance;
    b. The proposed structure does not create any privacy issues in relation to the adjacent properties and likely increases the privacy for the use of the Appellants' back yard; and

c. There were no objections from any of the other neighbours in the radius notification area.

2. The proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for the land within the Land Use Bylaw.

The Applicant is responsible for complying with all applicable federal, provincial and municipal enactment and any other applicable law and for obtaining all applicable permits, licenses and approvals. Building permits must be obtained from the Building Inspector who can be contacted at 780-459-1655.

Michael Kirk
Michael Kirk (Oct 10, 2024 11:42 MDT)

Chair

October 10, 2024

Date

DENIED

CITY OF ST. ALBERT

SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD DECISION
SDAB #LEG00969 - 2024

Re: PLAN 1021857; BLOCK 20; LOT 166A - known municipally as 19 Kandlewick Close, St. Albert, AB.

Regarding the appeal of a decision of the Development Officer in refusing a development permit application to widen a driveway.

The Appellant had no objection to the members of this Board hearing and deciding this Appeal.

Also, none of the members of the Board identified a conflict that would prevent them from hearing this Appeal.

The materials submitted and entered as Exhibits at the hearing are set out in Schedule A to this Decision.

The Board considered the Development Officer's written report and heard from the Development Officer who stated that:

The Appellant is appealing the decision of the Development Officer in refusing a development permit application to widen a driveway.

Driveway widening was constructed without consultation or permit approval and a complaint was received. An enforcement letter was sent on October 14, 2022. The contractor, Digiuseppe Interior Design Ltd., applied for a Development Permit on October 18, 2022. The proposed plan was circulated to Engineering Services for review. The applicant was notified of the remedies required to have the application approved. Negotiations were ongoing and a 1-year time extension was granted on November 27, 2022. No corrective action demonstrating compliance occurred and the Development Permit expired on November 27, 2023. Consequently, an enforcement letter was sent on June 20, 2024 requesting compliance with the standards and drainage bylaw. The contractor applied for a new Development Permit to widen the driveway.

The Development Permit application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The City of St. Albert Engineering branch has conducted a review of the application to assess compliance with the Surface Drainage Bylaw 14/2015 and the

Engineering Municipal Standards. It is determined that the design of the driveway does not comply with:

a. Surface Drainage Bylaw 14/2015, Part 3, Section 6.(1); and
b. Engineering Municipal Standards Appendix A - Engineering Standards drawing 3.15 documents.

Therefore, having consideration for the above, and as per the Land Use Bylaw, Section 3.11(5), the Development Officer is not satisfied that the proposed driveway configuration is compatible with relevant municipal enactments and regulations.

2. The driveway exceeds the maximum driveway width of 7.5m as per Section 3.2(1)(u).

Section 3.2(1) states: the following developments do not require a development permit:

(u) in a residential or Transition (T) District, hard surfacing of any yard for the purposes of providing vehicular access from a public roadway to a garage or carport, provided that such hard surfacing does not exceed 7.5m in width.

Therefore, a variance permit is required to allow the proposed driveway at the 10.744m width on City property. In exercising discretion pursuant to Section 3.14(1)(a) the Development Officer, in their opinion, also determined that: (the development would)

(i) materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment, or value of neighboring properties. (drainage)

And:

3. Section 3.14(2)- In exercising discretion under Section 3.14(1), the Development Officer shall consider the general purpose and intent of the appropriate land use district and the following:

(b) a variance from the provisions in this Bylaw shall not be granted when the variance will knowingly cause a structure or use to not comply with federal, provincial, or other municipal regulations.

Therefore, a variance cannot be granted for the proposed driveway as it does not conform with the relevant municipal enactments and regulations noted above.

The Development Officer in consultation with the City Engineer has proposed a driveway design that would meet the Surface Drainage Bylaw BL14/2015 and the requirements of the Engineering Municipal Standards. That plan is shown in this

report and was communicated to the applicant.[1] The applicant does not want to remedy the driveway to meet the regulations.

The Development Officer also referenced an email from Bethany Schatz, legal counsel with the City of St. Albert, to Kathleen Short, the Development Officer who denied the application for the development permit to widen the driveway.

That email, dated September 18, 2024[2] stated that:

> *The SDAB's jurisdiction is limited to hearing appeals from a decision of the Subdivision Authority or the Development Authority (s 23, Subdivision & Development Appeal Board Bylaw 20/1995).*
>
> *Meaning that the SDAB can only decide on matters that are within the scope of those underlying decisions – in this case it's a decision of the Development Authority.* ***To look at it another way, the SDAB can only decide on matters that are within the authority of the Subdivision Authority or Development Authority – the Development Authority can't vary the Engineering Standards or the Drainage Bylaw so neither can the SDAB. (emphasis added)***

The Development Officer made recommendations that should the Board grant the Appeal, administration requested that the conditions below be applied to the decision:

Conditions:

1. The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board approves a development permit for a driveway widening.

2. The driveway shall be as per the stamped approved plans as approved by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

3. Any changes must first be submitted to the Development Officer for review.

Notes:

a) A person applying for, or in possession of, a valid development permit is not relieved from full responsibility for ascertaining and complying with or carrying out development in accordance with the conditions of any covenant, caveat, easement, or other instrument affecting the building or land.

b) All construction must conform to the relevant requirements of the Alberta Building Code, the City of St. Albert municipal engineering standards and all applicable codes, laws, regulations, and standards.

c) The City of St. Albert does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the city. If you are concerned about the suitability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of St. Albert, in issuing this

[1] Exhibit 1, page 17
[2] Exhibit 10

development permit, makes no representations and offers no warranties as to the suitability of the property for any purpose or as to the presence or absence of any environmental contaminants on or within the property.

d) The city property on or adjacent to development including, but not limited to; the existing sidewalk, curb and boulevard features shall be protected from damage throughout the construction process. Damage caused by the owner, builder, tradesman, or suppliers shall be repaired to the satisfaction of the City of St. Albert Engineering Services. An inspection of the existing site conditions must be completed by city staff prior to commencement of the work. All snow and debris shall be removed from the sidewalk areas for the inspection. If necessary, a city representative will contact the applicant and request the site be cleared for inspection, prior to demolition and commencement of construction.

e) *An on-street construction permit is required for any construction taking place on City property including but not limited to driveway construction. Contact Engineering Services at 780-459-1654 to obtain the permit.*

In response to a question from the Board, the City noted that barrier free parking is regulated under the Building Code and not the Zoning Bylaw, and that the Building Code does not actually require barrier free parking on the site.

Also, in response to a question from the Board about the consequence of allowing the driveway extension to remain as is, the Engineering Department representative indicated that the driveway would still be in breach of the drainage bylaw and be an enforcement issue.

The Board heard from the Appellant who stated that:

The Appellants were represented by Deborah Digiuseppe, who was the general contractor for the widening of the Appellants' driveway. Ms. Digiuseppe advised that the reason behind the driveway extension was to provide further parking for persons with disabilities at the house.

This was to park a van with a ramp that extended from the passenger side of the van. Ms. Digiuseppe suggested that the City, in its approach to the development permit application for the driveway was ignoring the needs of people with disabilities. She referenced a number of site meetings that she proposed with the City and no City representatives showed up for the meetings.

It was pointed out that there were three generations living in the house, with the owners and their four adult children. The extension of the driveway was to accommodate the van used by the two disabled people who were identified as the grandparents.

The house has a triple car garage with a driveway to accommodate the triple car garage. The garage is used to park cars and the driveway is also used to park cars. There are six

drivers and three vehicles at the property, not including the van. The Board was advised that the occupants could not park on the street because it was a bus route. Ms. Digiuseppe indicated that there was no way to park the van on the driveway without the extension.

Ms. Digiuseppe indicated that she had been a contractor in St. Albert for 44 years and that the relationship with the City had been great up until this project.

Ms. Digiuseppe also described that the property between the Appellants and the adjacent property was somewhat swampy because of drainage and described the adjacent property being eight inches higher than the Appellants' property that resulted in drainage issues.

The presentation from Ms. Digiuseppe focused on the reason for the driveway extension, being a parking space for the handicap accessible van.

The Appellant also was asked to address the possibility of removing portions of the driveway extension that would bring the driveway extension into compliance and was proposed by City Engineering. The Appellants' representative indicated that this proposal was not acceptable and they were not prepared to reduce the size of the driveway extension to bring it into compliance.

In the written submissions provided by Ms. Digiuseppe, as part of the appeal included the following statement on page one entitled "Application for Permit":

> *"This project had been completed due to the fact that Chaaban, Bassem is required an accessibility van and appropriate parking before winter so he will be mobile. In haste to help out our client, with these requirements before winter this driveway was constructed before a permit had been applied for."*[3]

When she was questioned by the Board, acknowledging that she had been in business in St. Albert for over 44 years, Ms. Digiuseppe confirmed that she was aware that she needed a development permit before work was to be started and that she and the Appellants were aware of the jeopardy if a development permit had not been obtained.

The Board also considered/reviewed the following:

The adjacent neighbours who were most impacted provided an email dated September 30, 2024, in opposition to the Appeal.[4] In that email, the neighbours submitted the following:

- They were out of town and could not attend the hearing;
- They submitted that the standards needed to be upheld that preserved the character and integrity of their community;

[3] Exhibit 2, page 32
[4] Exhibit 6

- Before the driveway extension construction there was three metres of grass between their property with a gentle slope allowing for proper surface drainage;
- The construction of the driveway extension changed the grading on the appellant's property, lowering it several inches below their property;
- The Appellants' contractor advised that they were now responsible for changing the grading on their property as it was now higher;
- They personally advised the Appellants' contractor of the Surface Drainage Bylaw prior to construction of the driveway extension; and
- The Appellants' contractor did not know where the property line was as they believed the surveyor post was removed during excavation.

In response to this email, the Appellants provided an undated responding letter.[5] That letter stated the following:

- The response (undated) was written in response to the email in opposition to the Appeal;
- The slope of the driveway never changed. The area where concrete was now, was not lowered;
- The neighbouring property had always been at a higher elevation, which contributed to long-standing drainage issues between the two properties;
- The drainage issue has been a persistent problem; and
- Removing the concrete and re-installing grass will not rectify the drainage issue.

Both of these submissions were considered by the Board.

At the end of the hearing, and after preliminary deliberations the Development Officer projected on the screens in Council Chambers photographs from Google Maps that provided "street view" photographs of the Appellants' house from September 2015 and September 2022.

The first photograph[6] showed the house at 19 Kandlewick Close before any work on the extension to the driveway, and the second photo[7] showed the area where the driveway extension was built, but before the concrete was poured.

The Board asked for any submissions regarding these photographs to be provided by Wednesday October 9, 2024. Both parties provided submissions. They are summarized as follows:

City of St. Albert

The response from the City was as follows:

[5] Exhibit 7
[6] Part of Exhibit 12
[7] Also part of Exhibit 12

19 Kandlewick Close - September 2015

Note from Surface Drainage Bylaw Coordinator (Jay Qadiri): Based on the street view above and prior to the driveway expansion, both properties had proper sloping (positive grades) on their side, and the land sloped down from both houses to make a common swale for the water to get to the sidewalk. Prior to the grades being altered by 19 Kandlewick, there were no significant elevation differences at the common property line, and a landscape edging (wood) was there to prevent the spreading of landscaping rocks onto neighbor's side. If there was consultation with the City completed prior to construction, the City would have ensured both properties would drain as per the Surface Drainage Bylaw.

19 Kandlewick Close - June 2022

Note from Surface Drainage Bylaw Coordinator (Jay Qadiri): Based on the street view above and prior to the driveway expansion, both properties had proper sloping (positive grades) on their side, and the land sloped down from both houses to make a common swale for the water to get to the sidewalk. Prior to the grades being altered by 19 Kandlewick, there were no significant elevation differences at the common property line, and a landscape edging (wood) was there to prevent the spreading of landscaping rocks onto neighbor's side. If there was consultation with the City completed prior to construction, the City would have ensured both properties would drain as per the Surface Drainage Bylaw.

Appellants

Ms. Digiuseppe had the following comments:

The Google photo from September 2015 clearly shows that the grass is level with our driveway, as we previously stated. It is not higher than the driveway.

On closer inspection, it is evident that a wooden retaining wall was present on the neighbor's property, intended to serve as a water barrier. This supports the fact that the neighbor's property is at a higher elevation than ours, which led to water draining onto our land and creating a swamp-like effect. This also became a health concern due to the breeding and presence of mosquitoes in the area.

The June 2022 photo shows the fence leaning, which resulted from its removal during the extensive re-landscaping of our property.

At the rear of the home, landscapers were removing and replacing various features, necessitating the use of heavy equipment, which explains the visible tracks and dirt. Once the landscaping was completed, we constructed a deck. Please refer to all relevant permits we applied for with the City of St. Albert for confirmation.

Further, the Appellants' representative Ms. Digiuseppe, sent further photographs to the Clerk on October 8, 2024. Well after the hearing had closed. The Board did not receive the photographs and they were not before the Board as part of its decision.

It should be noted also that an enforcement letter was sent on November 29, 2023[8], prior to the June 20, 2024[9] enforcement letter.

The Board finds the following:

The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board of the City of St. Albert hereby denies the Appeal to widen a driveway located at **19 Kandlewick Close, St. Albert, AB.**

During submissions, the Appellants failed to establish that there was sufficient reason for the variance to be granted.

The Appellants stated that one of the primary reasons they were requesting the variance for the driveway extension was to allow parking for a vehicle which was handicap accessible and as such had a barrier free space and travel path for the van and its associated ramp. The Appellants indicated that there was a responsibility on the City to provide an opportunity for barrier free parking and that the driveway extension would provide that opportunity.

The City noted in their submission that barrier free parking is regulated under the Building Code and not the Zoning Bylaw, and that the Building Code does not actually require barrier free parking on the site.

Notwithstanding that, the City noted that the opportunity to provide barrier free parking was still available on the original driveway.

The Appellants noted that there were six individuals living on the property who can drive and may require parking, but was uncertain as to how many vehicles would be parked at the location at any one time. The Appellants noted that the three-car garage was to be used for parking and not storage.

As such, including the driveway in front of the garages, there should be six parking spaces available for parking with the garages and original driveway.

The Appellants admitted that the large van did not necessarily need to be driven forwards into the driveway, and could also be backed in, to allow the ramp to access a barrier free path on the driveway.

Further, the Appellants stated that the van could not be parked on the street as it would not create a barrier free path for those with physical disabilities. That being said, there is no reason that other vehicles and residents of the house could not park on the street.

---

[8] Exhibit 1, page 23
[9] Exhibit 1, page 25

Based on these statements, the Board agrees with the City that the opportunity to provide barrier free parking does exist on the existing approved driveway, and the extension is not necessary to accommodate a barrier free parking space or travel path.

Furthermore, it is not within the jurisdiction of the Board to modify or verify the engineering standards of the Drainage Bylaw that applied to this Development Permit application. Also, the City advised that even if the variance were granted, this did not affect the application of the Drainage Bylaw and the widened drive-way "as built" would still be an enforcement issue with the City.

It should also be noted that the City proposed a solution to allow the widened driveway to exist in large part "as built" as set out in Exhibit 1 page 17. The Appellants' representative Ms. Digiuseppe advised that the Appellants did not agree with this proposal and wanted to leave the drive way "as built".

The Board makes its decision for the following reasons:

1. The Board concludes that (in accordance with section 687(3)(d) of the *Municipal Government Act*) the variance will unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, and/or materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land because:

    a. The most affected neighbour provided submissions in relation to the widened driveway that affected the drainage between the two properties and the need to uphold the bylaws in relation to drainage;

    b. The Appellants' representative failed to provide any substantive submissions on why the variance should be granted;

    c. The Appellants' commenced the construction of the driveway widening without a development permit and were aware of the jeopardy should the development permit not be granted;

    d. There was sufficient parking available on the existing driveway to allow for barrier free access to the disabled individuals who used the van;

    e. The City proposed a reasonable solution to reduce the size of the widened driveway that would bring the widened portion of the driveway into compliance with the Engineering Standards and Drainage Bylaw that was rejected outright; and

    f. Should a variance been granted, the existence of the widened driveway "as built" was still an enforcement issue for the City.

The Applicant is responsible for complying with all applicable federal, provincial and municipal enactment and any other applicable law and for obtaining all applicable permits, licenses and approvals. Building permits must be obtained from the Building Inspector who can be contacted at 780-459-1655.

Michael Kirk
Michael Kirk (Oct 16, 2024 13:28 MDT)

Chair

October 16, 2024

Date

SDAB Hearing held October 2, 2024
Re: 19 Kandlewick Close, St. Albert, AB

Exhibit List

Exhibit 1: ..... Development Officer Report (Agenda Package pages 11-26)

Exhibit 2: ..... Appellant Appeal Form (Agenda Package page 27)

Exhibit 3: ..... Appellant Supporting Material (Agenda Package pages 28-63)

Exhibit 4: ..... Development Permit Decision (Agenda Package pages 64-65)

Exhibit 5: ..... Radius Map & Address Labels (Agenda Package pages 66-67)

Exhibit 6: ..... Email from Affected Party dated Sept 30, 2024

Exhibit 7: ..... Undated Letter from owner received Oct 1, 2024 in response to email from Affected Party dated Sept 30, 2024

Exhibit 8: ..... Appellant's PowerPoint Presented at Hearing

Exhibit 9: ..... Development Officer PowerPoint presented at Hearing

Exhibit 10: ..... Bethany Schatz, Solicitor, City of St Albert email dated Sept 18, 2024

Exhibit 11: ..... SDAB Hearing Zoom Recording October 2, 2024

Exhibit 12: ..... Two (2) Google Street Photos (Sept 2015 & June 2022) with comments - Appellant & City of St. Albert Engineers