



## AGENDA

**INTERMUNICIPAL SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT  
APPEAL BOARD (ISDAB)  
VIA TELECONFERENCE  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, LEDUC COUNTY CENTRE, NISKU  
Friday, January 29, 2021**

1. **Order and Roll Call** – 9:00 a.m.
2. **Organizational meeting of the Board**
  - a) Nomination of Chair
  - b) Nomination of Vice Chair
3. **Agenda Adoption**
4. **Adoption of Previous Minutes**
  - \* December 18, 2020 Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Meeting

5. **Subdivision and Development Appeal Hearing - D08-2020**

- \* a) 9:05 a.m.

Apellant(s)	Gord Pritchard, on behalf of Steve Oke - Brandt Developments Ltd.
Applicant's name	Laviolette Engineering
Landowner's name	2278048 Alberta Ltd.
Leduc County Municipal Roll #	6313900
Legal description of subject property	Lot 7, Block 14, Plan 7821344, E-13-50-25-W4
Municipal address	706 - 11 Avenue, Nisku Industrial Park
Nature of development application	Addition to existing building - 529.55 sq.m (5700 sq.ft.) & requesting a setback variance to rear property line (north property line) for the proposed development from 6.0 m (19.68 ft.) to 1.26 m (4.13 ft.) - Industrial General (seacan retrofit)
Development permit application #	D20-203

6. **Next Meeting Date** – call of the chair
7. **Adjournment**

**5. Preliminary Matter**  
- January 26, 2021 Request for Adjournment, Brandt Developments Ltd.)

Legend  
\* Items Attached To Agenda

**MINUTES OF THE INTERMUNICIPAL SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD MEETING, LEDUC COUNTY, HELD ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 2021 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER OF THE COUNTY CENTRE BUILDING, NISKU, ALBERTA.**

---

**Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m., Friday, January 29, 2021 by Joyce Gavan, Clerk of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board with Board Members Mary-Ann McDonald, Pat Rudiger, Rod Giles and Rick Smith present.

Also present were:

- Lynn White, Recording Secretary
- Colin Richards, Team Lead Development
- Rae-Lynne Spila, Municipal Engineer

Present via teleconference were:

- Charlene Haverland, Manager - Development Services
- Steve Neff, Manager - Safety Codes
- Gordon Pritchard, legal counsel on behalf of Brandt Developments Ltd. (Appellant)
- Steve Oke, Brandt Developments Ltd. (Appellant)
- Barry Laviolette, Laviolette Engineering (Applicant)
- Dustin Anderson, Rockbox (Applicant)

Also in attendance was one other individual (via teleconference).

**Organizational Meeting of the Board**

Clerk Joyce Gavan indicated that in accordance with Bylaw No. 33-19 establishing the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, the Chair and Vice Chair are to be elected at the first meeting of each year.

**Nominations for Chair**

Clerk Gavan called for nominations for the position of Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Board Member Rudiger nominated Board Member Mary-Ann McDonald as Chair.

**Nominations Cease - Chair**

**01-21** Board Member Rudiger -- that nominations cease for Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Carried

Clerk Gavan declared Board Member McDonald elected, by acclamation, as Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

**Assume the Chair**

Chair McDonald assumed the Chair.



**Nominations for Vice Chair**

Chair McDonald called for nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Board Member Giles nominated Board Member Rudiger for Vice Chair.

**Nominations Cease - Vice Chair**

**02-21** Board Member Giles -- that nominations cease for Vice Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Carried

Chair McDonald declared Board Member Rudiger elected as Vice Chair of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

**Agenda Adoption**

**03-21** Board Member Smith -- that the agenda for the January 29, 2021 Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be accepted as circulated.

Carried

**Adoption of Previous Minutes – December 18, 2020**

**04-21** Board Member Rudiger -- that the December 18, 2020 Subdivision and Development Appeal Board minutes be confirmed as circulated.

Carried

**Preliminary matter - Request for 2<sup>nd</sup> Adjournment**

Chair McDonald called the hearing to order at 9:03 a.m. provided introductory remarks and noted there is a preliminary matter to consider which is a second request for adjournment submitted on January 26, 2021 by the appellant(s) Brandt Developments Ltd. for the following reason:

- Brandt has not received information from neither the County nor the applicant with respect to their inquiries.

Chair McDonald called upon the following to provide comments with respect to the consideration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> adjournment:

**Brandt Developments Ltd.**

Gordon Pritchard provided the following comments:

- Want to ensure there are no negatives to this property.
- Want to ensure all issues have been properly addressed.
- Appears that Mr. Anderson is looking to speak with Mr. Oke to alleviate issues.
- Seeking adjournment so parties can work together.
- Want to understand development.
- Looking for more clarity to specific questions.
- Want to ensure stormwater management system is in place.
- Because of proximity to property line, want to ensure water is dealt with.

Steve Oke provided the following comments:

- Need to protect assets of our organization.



- Concerned about drainage and impacts on our property.

#### Laviolette Engineering

Barry Laviolette provided the following comments:

- Applied for permits and received permits for both development and building.
- Feel requirements have been met, e.g., site drainage.
- Have answered all questions by Brandt Developments.
- Can ensure Brandt Developments there will be no negative impacts to their site.
- Do not agree with adjournment as it is holding up construction.
- Delays are increasing project costs.
- Have done everything we were asked to do.
- Have gone above and beyond to provide information.

#### Development Authority

Colin Richards provided a timeline of events

- November 9, 2020 - Decision issued by Leduc County to approve the application.
- December 18, 2020 - Leduc County advised appellants of the adjournment to January 29, 2021 in order to address the concerns set out in the appeal with a view to hopefully avoid the requirement for the appeal to proceed.
- December 23, 2020 - Leduc County provided responses to the appellants concerning their questions and those are the answers discussed in the staff report.
- January 12, 2021 - Leduc County followed up to see if the answers satisfied their concerns and to provide some additional drawings provided by the applicants engineers concerning drainage flow and property grades, to which the County was told the appellants would get back to us.
- January 20, 2021 - After receiving no further response from the appellants, and following the submission of the staff report for the January 29, 2021 ISDAB Hearing, another request for further adjournment was received.

#### Recess

The Board recessed at 9:13 a.m. to consider the request for adjournment and reconvened at 9:21 a.m.

Chair McDonald confirmed the Board has considered the request for adjournment by Brandt Developments Ltd. and the Board has denied the request for adjournment for the following reasons:

1. The parties had six weeks to receive and exchange information.
2. The applicant(s) and development authority were opposed to the second adjournment as they felt they had provided adequate information to the appellant(s).
3. The appellant(s) expressed they are not looking to stop development - they want to have a better understanding of the proposed development and ensure the conditions are addressed to avoid negative impacts on their property.

**05-21** Board member Giles -- that the request for adjournment by Brandt Developments Ltd. relating to Development Permit D20-203 as noted above be denied and that the hearing proceed.

Carried



**Appeal by Gord Pritchard, on behalf of Steve Oke, Brandt Developments Ltd. relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-203 by Laviolette Engineering for an addition to existing building and requesting a setback variance to rear property line (north property line) for the proposed development from 6.0 m (19.68 ft.) to 1.26 m (4.13 ft.) - Industrial General (seacan retrofit) located at Lot 7, Block 14, Plan 7821344, E-13-50-25-W4 (706 - 11 Avenue, Nisku Industrial Park).**

---

Chair McDonald called the hearing to order at 9:22 a.m., provided introductory remarks and indicated the hearing is being held via teleconference.

Chair McDonald then called upon the Board secretary to introduce the subject of this appeal.

Joyce Gavan, Clerk, advised of the appeal by Gord Pritchard, on behalf of Steve Oke, Brandt Developments Ltd. relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-203 by Laviolette Engineering for an addition to existing building and requesting a setback variance to rear property line (north property line) for the proposed development from 6.0 m (19.68 ft.) to 1.26 m (4.13 ft.) - Industrial General (seacan retrofit) located at Lot 7, Block 14, Plan 7821344, E-13-50-25-W4 (706 - 11 Avenue, Nisku Industrial Park).

The focus for appeal is as follows:

1. Issue of drainage:
  - Condition #14 states *"the development shall not cause any adverse drainage impact on adjacent properties or flooding of nearby ditches in excess of their capabilities"*.
  - The Development Authority advise the drainage was reviewed however, there has been no explanation or details as to how this issue was reviewed and what steps were taken to ensure that there would be no negative impact to Brandt's property.
2. Requesting clarification from the Development Authority regarding:
  - potential drainage impacts on their property
  - considerations of alternative designs for building layout
  - placement on the surplus area located on the north and east portion of the property
  - specific answers on the applicant's design and layout for the proposed building and whether during the application and approval process any consideration was given to alternate locations for the siting of the building on the north and east portion of the subject parcel.

Joyce Gavan, Clerk, advised the following information is attached for the Board:

- 1) Notice of ISDAB notice of adjourned hearing package dated December 18, 2020 (whereby the Board adjourned the appeal hearing with respect to the appeal received December 3, 2020);
- 2) Notice of Development Appeal received November 30, 2020 by Brandt Developments Ltd.;
- 3) Development Authority's submission including:
  - November 9, 2020 Notice of Development Authority decision (conditional approval)
  - Development Permit Application D20-203
  - November 9, 2020 conditionally approved plot plan



- Site plan
  - building plans
  - business information
  - key plan
  - Leduc County mapping
  - Referral comments dated November 4, 2020 from Brandt Developments Ltd.
- 4) Applicant's submission (Laviolette Engineering Ltd.)

The Board confirmed the appeal was submitted properly and acceptable to the Board.

Chair McDonald asked if any Board member felt a need step down from this hearing within the boundaries of conflict of interest, and there was no one.

Chair McDonald asked if anyone had any objection to any of the members of the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing this appeal, and there was no objection indicated.

Chair McDonald explained the purpose of the hearing, the order of presentation and the procedures to be followed.

Chair McDonald called upon the Development Authority to provide background information.

Colin Richards, Team Lead Development Services, provided a PowerPoint presentation relating Development Permit D20-203 and the appeal by Brandt Developments Ltd., highlighting the following:

- This appeal relates to a 1.4 acre industrial property here in Nisku, located directly off of 8A Street and approximately 100 metres north of Airport Road.
- Existing development on the property includes a 4,600 sq. ft. industrial building and a 540 sq. ft. office building. The remainder of the property is currently undeveloped storage yard space.
- The subject property, along with adjacent properties north of 8A Street are districted as industrial, with the adjacent properties located south of 8A street being designated under the service commercial district.
- The application that is subject to this appeal proposed a 5,700 sq. ft. addition to the existing building, that is designed to be attached to the northern portion of the existing structure as shown on the site plan. The building and overall property will be utilized for an industrial business retrofitting shipping containers.
- In order to accommodate the building in the chosen location, the application required a setback variance request to the boundary of the northern property from 6 metres to 1.26 metres. Typically, industrial building expansions would be dealt with as permitted uses, which do not require adjacent landowner circulation, however, as this application requested a setback variance, it automatically became a discretionary use application where neighbour circulation is required. Just note that the western elevation of the proposed expansion does meet the required 2 metre setback of the industrial district and therefore was not subject to any variance consideration.

- During the circulation of the proposed development, the owner of the adjoining parcel to the north where the variance was requested did not provide any comments or concerns in relation to the proposal. The adjacent landowners to the west, who are the appellants, provided a letter of concern objecting to the variance for three reasons, being, drainage concerns from the building expansion, the design of the development impacting buildings on adjacent lots and that proposed siting could be located elsewhere on the property.
- Prior to approving the development, the planning department considered the concerns of the objectors with our professional engineers who confirmed that the proposed roof drain locations would ensure minimal drainage is coming from the rear of the lot and therefore there were no drainage concerns subject to our standard approval drainage conditions.
- With regard to the siting concerns of the building, the location was discussed with the applicants who confirmed the proposed location was imperative to their business operation and locating the building elsewhere would hinder their business model and desires to operate from Nisku Business Park.
- The appellants note that their appeal of the decision is focused on the matter of site drainage. The appellants note that a condition of approval directs that the development shall not cause adverse drainage impacts upon surrounding properties, however, they feel that the County did not provide sufficient information to them to address how the concern was reviewed and how the County would ensure that no negative impacts to the appellant's property would occur.
- In response to this, the County can confirm that the plans submitted to date in support of the application satisfy the County's Engineering Department that there will not be any adverse drainage events created due to the proposed development. Furthermore, conditions are in place to ensure that should any unforeseen and unexpected drainage impacts be felt on adjacent properties because of the development, the landowner is responsible to fix them through a number of acceptable means that may include re-grading or the construction of drainage swales.
- The applicants have also confirmed through their own engineers that the existing grades along the proposed building or the west property lines will not be changed due to the expansion and that the design of the building should actually result in a smaller volume of water being directed along the western property boundary.
- With regard to the other concerns raised by the appellants, the County did not find any justifiable planning rationale to deny the request for a variance to the northern boundary, especially when the landowner to the north did not lodge any concerns with the proposal and our engineers do not foresee any additional drainage impacts being felt due to the proposed siting in this location.
- In consideration of any concerns relating to detailed building design and compliance with the Alberta code, those matters will be addressed through the submission of building permit applications that are typically only submitted once planning permission is confirmed. If a decision rendered by the appeal board is to approve the development then detailed designs will be required and considered by the county's safety codes department before development can commence. Should the designs not meet any required code, then the County will work

with the applicant to ensure all design elements are up to code. If any issues with the physical location of the building arise at that stage, then the landowner would be required to obtain a new development permit prior to the issuance of building permits.

- As a result of this, the County is satisfied that the proposed development in the proposed location will not result in any drainage or safety code issues on adjacent properties. In the rare scenario that it does however, the conditions of the development approval and the County's established planning enforcement process would ensure that the onus is on the landowner to rectify any issues to the satisfaction of the County.
- Based on this, the County deems that the approval and variance within were correctly issued and the decision should be upheld.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members of Development Authority staff.

In response to questions by a Board member, Mr. Richards advised of the following:

- With regard to variances, every district in the County has setbacks which are discretionary. When an application is received, Leduc County does their own review and checks with adjacent landowners. Leduc County would also seek comments from engineers and safety codes to ensure development does not impact drainage or adjacent landowners.
- May see a handful of variance requests each year throughout the County.

In response to a question from the appellant, Rae-Lynne Spila indicated that a stormwater study was not conducted. Upon reviewing the drainage path it was concluded there would be no significant changes to drainage and should not pose any issues in the future.

Chair McDonald called upon the applicant(s), Lavolette Engineering to speak to the proposed development.

Barry Lavolette, Lavolette Engineering, provided the following information based on the submitted documentation forming part of the agenda package:

- 1) Do not have a presentation.
- 2) Concerned that there wasn't a groundwater study completed.
- 3) No other evidence to present.

In response to questions by Board members, Rae-Lynne Spila advised of the following:

- Water is draining within property lines which continues into the ditch.

In response to questions from Board members, Barry Lavolette provided the following information:

- Did a detailed survey because of Brandt Developments concerns.
- Found that properties on Brandt side and our side are both quite well graded.
- Water drains well down the property line.



- The shop is being constructed with a gabled roof which should shed more water to the west as opposed to the east which means less water running down that property line than there would be without the development.

Chair McDonald asked if there were any questions by the Board members of the appellant(s).

In response to a question by a Board member, Rae-Lynne Spila advised water draining to the east will make it to the ditch as it currently does.

In response to a question from a Board Member, Barry Laviolette indicated that other options were considered for the location of the shop. Because of work flows, the current plan was their best option.

Chair McDonald called upon anyone wishing to speak in support of the appeal (against the conditionally approved proposed development) and there was no one.

Chair McDonald asked the appellant(s) if they had any final comments.

Gordon Pritchard indicated that some of the information provided today was new information and it was helpful. It would have been helpful if this information could have been shared during the initial process.

Chair McDonald asked the applicant(s) if they had a final comments.

Barry Laviolette indicated that they are very open to providing anything that is required.

Chair McDonald then called upon anyone wishing to speak against the appeal (in support of the conditionally approved proposed development) and there was no one.

Chair McDonald asked the clerk to read/present any other relevant information and/or correspondence, and Ms. Gavan advised there was none.

Chair McDonald asked administrative staff to provide final comments.

Colin Richards provided the following closing comments:

- The last information that the County received was passed on as soon as it was made available. That information will go through the engineering process.
- The Development Authority feels that the application was submitted properly.
- Believe that sufficient safety measures are in place in the case of drainage issues.
- If issues do occur, there are enforcement measures in place to deal with them.
- The proposed building design and location have passed all safety codes elements.

Chair McDonald called upon the appellant(s) to provide final comments.

Gordon Pritchard indicated that they felt that the information from the County was insufficient and that they were being dismissed. Overall, they were disappointed in the process.



Chair McDonald called upon the applicant(s) to provide final comments.

Barry Laviolette indicated that Brandt Developments is not occupying the space and that they have it rented out. The tenant didn't want anything to happen and they did not want anything built.

Chair McDonald asked the appellant(s), if they felt they received a fair hearing, and Mr. Pritchard responded affirmatively.

### **Conclusion of Public Hearing**

Chair McDonald declared the Public Hearing concluded at 9:52 a.m.

### **In-Camera**

**06-21** Board Member Giles -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meet in-camera.

Carried

The in-camera session commenced at 9:53 a.m.

### **Revert to Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Meeting**

**07-21** Board Member Rudiger -- that the in-camera session revert to the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting.

Carried

The in-camera session reverted to the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting at 10:02 a.m.

**Appeal by Gord Pritchard, on behalf of Steve Oke, Brandt Developments Ltd. relating to conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-203 by Laviolette Engineering for an addition to existing building and requesting a setback variance to rear property line (north property line) for the proposed development from 6.0 m (19.68 ft.) to 1.26 m (4.13 ft.) - Industrial General (seacan retrofit) located at Lot 7, Block 14, Plan 7821344, E-13-50-25-W4 (706 - 11 Avenue, Nisku Industrial Park).**

---

**08-21** Board Member Giles -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board deny the appeal by Gord Pritchard, on behalf of Steve Oke, Brandt Developments Ltd. and upholds the conditional approval of Development Permit Application D20-203 by Laviolette Engineering for an addition to existing building and approves a setback variance to rear property line (north property line) for the proposed development from 6.0 m (19.68 ft.) to 1.26 m (4.13 ft.) - Industrial General (seacan retrofit) located at Lot 7, Block 14, Plan 7821344, E-13-50-25-W4 (706 - 11 Avenue, Nisku Industrial Park).

### **Findings of Fact**

1. The appellant(s) expressed drainage concerns and questions regarding the design and layout of the building; and whether during the application and approval process any consideration was given to alternate locations for the siting of the building on the north and east portion of the subject parcel.
2. The Board heard evidence from the development authority and engineering department that should appease the concerns of the appellant(s):



- i. the drainage plan that was submitted along with the application was reviewed and satisfied the county engineering department; the municipal engineer provided clarification to questions posed around drainage;
  - ii. the development authority demonstrated that drainage impacts will be monitored and addressed through the development permit approval conditions;
  - iii. the parcel to the north of the subject property, where the setback variance is applicable, did not object to the application and would not directly affect the appellant's property;
  - iv. the engineering department conducted a site visit and indicated there are sufficient measures in place to remedy any impact on nearby properties.
3. The Board did not hear any evidence from the appellants how the drainage would affect their property.

The Board considered the following legislation in making their decision and feel sufficient measures have been taken to remedy any impacts on nearby properties:

Land Use Bylaw No. 7-08

The subject property is districted Industrial (IND) use. The purpose of this district is to accommodate a range of compatible industrial and commercial uses (with a low to moderate impact on adjacent land uses).

Part 3.6 provides the development authority may grant a variance provided:

- the proposed use complies with those prescribed in the bylaw;
- the development is consistent with the general intent of the district and the overall character of the area; and
- the development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the area or materially affect the use, enjoyment or value of nearby property.

Conditions for Approval

In consideration of the above the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board approves Development Permit Application D20-203, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is granted based on the information provided by the applicant for the approved development only and no other development.
2. The approved development shall be located as shown on the approved plot plan.
3. The minimum required rear yard setback of 6.0 metres for a principal building pursuant to Section 9.14.4 of Leduc County Land Use Bylaw No. 7-08 is varied to allow a deficiency of 4.74 metres (i.e. 79%) thereby decreasing the minimum required rear yard setback to 1.26 metres for the approved development towards the northerly property line.
4. No use or operation shall cause or create any significant impact or nuisance during normal operation which, in the opinion of the Development Authority, may be objectionable beyond the boundary of the site which contains it, by way of but not limited to the following:
  - i) odorous and/or toxic matter
  - ii) dust, fly ash or other particulate matter
  - iii) noise
  - iv) vibrations



- v) air pollution
  - vi) industrial waste
  - vii) water quality deterioration
  - viii) groundwater quality or quantity deterioration
  - ix) glare
  - x) radiation emission
  - xi) high brightness light source
5. The site shall be maintained in a neat and orderly manner including the containment of all construction materials and refuse, to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.
  6. No outdoor sandblasting or spray painting of any kind shall be permitted on site.
  7. Any signage related to this development requires the approval of Leduc County by a separate development permit application.
  8. There shall be no outdoor storage of goods, products, materials or equipment permitted within a required front, side or rear yard setback.
  9. The height of the outdoor storage shall not exceed 2.89 metres (9.5 feet).
  10. Onsite parking to employees and visitors shall be provided pursuant to Part 6.9.2(c) of the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw No. 7-08.
  11. The applicant/landowner shall submit a landscaping plan in accordance with Part 6.6 of the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw No. 7-08.
  12. All portions of the site being utilized for industrial activity or vehicular movement that are not landscaped shall be paved and/or graveled to reduce dust generation.
  13. The movement of vehicles to and from the site shall not leave behind mud/dirt on county road surfaces.
  14. The development shall not cause any adverse drainage impact on adjacent properties or flooding of nearby ditches in excess of their capabilities.
  15. All new accesses, approaches or upgrades, including driveways required off of a Leduc County public roadway, as a result of the development shall first require an Access Application to be provided to the satisfaction of, and approved by Leduc County Public Works & Engineering.
  16. The applicant shall provide engineered (signed and stamped) pre and post-construction surface drainage plans for approval by Leduc County Public Works and Engineering.
  17. Lot grading shall be provided in accordance with the approved lot grading plan, unless a new lot grading plan is submitted and approved by Leduc County Public Works & Engineering prior to commencement of this project.
  18. The applicant/landowner shall provide fire fighting access at all times to the satisfaction of Leduc County Fire Services.
  19. No further development, expansion or change in use is permitted unless approved by Leduc County.



The applicant is also advised of the following:

1. This Development Permit is issued under the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw 7-08. It does not exempt you from compliance with any other municipal bylaw or statutory plan applicable to the approved development, any relevant federal and provincial statute or regulation, or any easement, covenant, agreement or contract affecting the subject lands.
2. The County administers the Safety Codes Act and you must obtain any Safety Codes (building, electrical, gas or plumbing) permit(s) required prior to commencing construction. Increased setback distances from property lines, and/or modifications to plans for proposed buildings may be required in order to achieve compliance under the Alberta Safety Codes Act.
3. To contact Leduc Public Works & Engineering at 780-979-6185 regarding approach approvals and Road Use Agreements as required.
4. To contact Leduc County Fire Services at 780-955-7099 regarding compliance with the Alberta Fire Code.
5. Please be advised that this development may initiate inspections from the Assessment Department. If you would like to schedule an appointment or have questions, please contact the Assessment Department at 780-955-6412.

Development Permit D20-203 shall expire after one year from the date of decision unless development has commenced.

Carried

#### **Next Meeting**

The next scheduled Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting will be held at the call of the Chair.

#### **Adjournment**

**09-21** Board Member Smith -- that the Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be adjourned.

Carried

The Intermunicipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting concluded at 10:04 a.m.

  
Chair

  
Clerk