



**EDMONTON
TRIBUNALS**

*Subdivision &
Development
Appeal Board*

*10019 – 103 Avenue NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0G9
P: 780-496-6079 F: 780-577-
3537
sdab@edmonton.ca
edmontonsdab.ca*

Date: June 29, 2017
Project Number: 245323279-001
File Number: SDAB-D-17-110

Notice of Decision

- [1] On June 21, 2017, the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the “Board”) heard an appeal that was filed on **May 24, 2017**. The appeal concerned the decision of the Development Authority, issued on May 11, 2017, to refuse the following development:

Construct an Accessory Building (rear detached Garage 7.32 metres by 9.14m) and to demolish an existing Accessory Building (rear detached garage)

- [2] The subject property is on Plan 4116HW Blk 12 Lot 13, located at 8328 - 120 Street NW, within the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone. The Mature Neighbourhood Overlay applies to the subject property.
- [3] The following documents were received prior to the hearing and form part of the record:
- Copy of the Development Permit application with attachments, proposed plans, and the refused Development Permit;
 - The Development Officer’s written submissions; and
 - The Appellant’s written submissions, including letters of support and photographs.

Preliminary Matters

- [4] At the outset of the appeal hearing, the Presiding Officer confirmed with the parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the panel.
- [5] The Presiding Officer outlined how the hearing would be conducted, including the order of appearance of parties, and no opposition was noted.
- [6] The appeal was filed on time, in accordance with Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26 (the “*Municipal Government Act*”).

Summary of Hearing*i) Position of the Appellant, Mr. and Mrs. Bentley*

- [7] The proposed Height is only 0.78 metres over the maximum allowable Height.
- [8] The angle of the roof is to the south, which is conducive to the use of solar paneling. They are requesting the additional Height to accommodate a solar panel.
- [9] The existing garage was built in 1952, is starting to lean and needs to be replaced.
- [10] They received letters from neighbouring property owners, including the most affected neighbour, and the Community League in support of the proposed development.
- [11] The proposed detached garage and the principal Dwelling will cover 25.3 percent of the property.
- [12] The proposed development meets the guidelines of the Windsor Park Community and the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay.
- [13] Ms. Bentley referred to the photographs in her submission showing the size and type of garages in the area.
- [14] There are three detached garages that are visible from their property and one of the houses has a solar panel.
- [15] The proposed detached garage will not affect the streetscape or pedestrians in the area.
- [16] The detached garage will shade the back lane in the morning and the back yard in the afternoon but will not shade the neighbouring properties.
- [17] In response to questions by the Board, they stated that the extra Height of the detached garage will be used for storage only. They have a legal Secondary Suite in the basement of their home.

ii) Position of the Development Officer, Ms. Watts

- [18] Ms. Watts does not have the power to vary the Height of the proposed detached garage.
- [19] She referred to the photographs submitted by the Appellant and outlined the Height of those garages that were approved by Sustainable Development or approved by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.
- [20] She stated that the Appellant provided sufficient Community Consultation.

iii) Rebuttal of the Appellant, Mr. Bentley

[21] Mr. and Mrs. Bentley did not have anything to add in rebuttal.

Decision

[22] The appeal is ALLOWED and the decision of the Development Authority is REVOKED. The development is GRANTED as applied for to the Development Authority, subject to the following CONDITIONS:

1. This Development Permit authorizes the development of an Accessory Building (rear detached Garage 7.32 metres by 9.14 metres @ 5.08 metres in Height) and to demolish an existing Accessory Building (rear detached garage).
2. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the stamped and approved drawings.
3. The Accessory Building shall not exceed 5.08 metres in Height.
4. Eave projections shall not exceed 0.46 metres into required Setbacks or Separations spaces less than 1.2 metres. (Reference Section 44.1(b))

[23] In granting the development the following variances to the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* are allowed:

1. The maximum allowable Height of 4.3 metres as per Section 50.3(2) is varied to allow an excess of 0.78 metres, thereby increasing the maximum allowed Height to 5.08 metres.

Reasons for Decision

[24] Single Detached Housing is a Permitted Use in the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone. A rear detached Garage is Accessory to Single Detached Housing and is, therefore, a Permitted Use in this Zone (Section 50.1(2) *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*).

[25] There were no objections to the proposed development and there is written support from the Community League and the four most affected neighbours.

[26] The detached Garage immediately adjacent to the proposed development is also over Height, so the proposed development is not uncharacteristic of the neighbourhood.

[27] The Board accepts evidence submitted that there will be no sun shadowing impact on the immediately adjacent neighbours with the extra Height of the detached Garage.

- [28] The Board notes that the total Site Coverage of the house and Garage are considerably less than the maximum allowed. This will mitigate the increased massing caused by the Height variance.
- [29] The Development Officer indicated that the only reason for refusing the permit is that she has no discretion to allow a variance with respect to Height.
- [30] Based on the above, it is the opinion of the Board that the proposed development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, nor materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land.



Mr. M. Young, Presiding Officer
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Important Information for the Applicant/Appellant

1. This is not a Building Permit. A Building Permit must be obtained separately from the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.
2. Obtaining a Development Permit does not relieve you from complying with:
 - a) the requirements of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*, insofar as those requirements have not been relaxed or varied by a decision of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board,
 - b) the requirements of the *Alberta Safety Codes Act*,
 - c) the *Alberta Regulation 204/207 – Safety Codes Act – Permit Regulation*,
 - d) the requirements of any other appropriate federal, provincial or municipal legislation,
 - e) the conditions of any caveat, covenant, easement or other instrument affecting a building or land.
3. When an application for a Development Permit has been approved by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, it shall not be valid unless and until any conditions of approval, save those of a continuing nature, have been fulfilled.
4. A Development Permit will expire in accordance to the provisions of Section 22 of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw, Bylaw 12800*, as amended.
5. This decision may be appealed to the Alberta Court of Appeal on a question of law or jurisdiction under Section 688 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26. If the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board is served with notice of an application for leave to appeal its decision, such notice shall operate to suspend the Development Permit.
6. When a decision on a Development Permit application has been rendered by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, the enforcement of that decision is carried out by the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.

NOTE: The City of Edmonton does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the City. If you are concerned about the stability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of Edmonton, when issuing a 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 the property.



**EDMONTON
TRIBUNALS**

*Subdivision &
Development
Appeal Board*

*10019 – 103 Avenue NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0G9
P: 780-496-6079 F: 780-577-
3537
sdab@edmonton.ca
edmontonsdab.ca*

Date: June 29, 2017
Project Number: 111458875-004
File Number: SDAB-D-17-109

Notice of Decision

[1] On June 21, 2017, the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the “Board”) heard an appeal that was filed on **May 29, 2017**. The appeal concerned the decision of the Development Authority, issued on May 23, 2017, to refuse the following development:

Install (1) Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Freestanding Sign (3.7 metres by 7.4 metres single sided facing SW) (replace DP: 111458875-001) (ASTRAL OUT-OF-HOME)

[2] The subject property is on Plan 0122444 Lot 7A, located at 13715 - Manning Drive NW, within the CB2 General Business Zone. The Major Commercial Corridors Overlay and the Clareview Town Centre Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan apply to the subject property.

[3] The following documents were received prior to the hearing and form part of the record:

- Copy of the Development Permit application with attachments, proposed plans, and the refused Development Permit;
- The Development Officer’s written submissions; and
- The Appellant’s written submissions.

[4] The following exhibits were presented during the hearing and form part of the record:

- Exhibit A – Appellant’s speaking notes

Preliminary Matters

[5] At the outset of the appeal hearing, the Presiding Officer confirmed with the parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the panel.

[6] The Presiding Officer outlined how the hearing would be conducted, including the order of appearance of parties, and no opposition was noted.

[7] The appeal was filed on time, in accordance with Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26 (the “*Municipal Government Act*”).

Summary of Hearing

i) Position of the Appellant, Mr. Grey

[8] Mr. Grey is the Real Estate manager for the Appellant, Astral Out-Of-Home.

[9] He confirmed that this is an application to renew the existing Sign already in place.

[10] He referred to a letter from the property owner in support of the proposed Sign.

[11] Mr. Grey reviewed his presentation, marked “Exhibit A”.

[12] He applied for a Development Permit Application on Aug 29, 2016 to extend the duration of the Sign that was previously approved by the Board on September 29, 2011 with an expiration date of October 14, 2016.

[13] The original permit application requested a variance to increase the Height of the Sign to adjust for the approximate 2.13 metres differential in Grade from where the base of the Sign is located on the property, and the roadway at Manning Drive and 137 Avenue, where the Sign is oriented to be viewed from.

[14] Sustainable Development does not have the authority to grant variances in Height. The original Development Permit application was refused and subsequently approved by the Board. The Height of the Sign was approved at 9.45 metres from Grade level on the property, which results in an overall Height of 7.32 metres when viewed from Grade level at 137 Avenue and Manning Drive, lower than the 8.0 metre maximum allowable under the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*. Enforcing a maximum Height of 8.0 metres would result in the Sign being 1.45 metres lower than it currently appears, with the bottom of the Sign being only 2.21 metres above Grade when viewed from the roadway and would appear excessively low. He directed the Board to review Page 3 and Page 4 of his submission.

[15] The Sign as it sits does not aesthetically appear out of place in respect to other freestanding Signs and structures in the area. He directed the Board to review Page 5 of his submission.

[16] Prior to the existing digital third party sign being approved, the property contained a third party “Superboard” for several years, that had more than double the square footage of the Digital Sign that replaced it. Prior to building the existing Sign, a significant amount of money was invested in landscaping around the base of the Sign to improve the overall aesthetics of the Sign and property. He directed the Board to review Page 6 of his submission.

- [17] The required Setback of the Sign from the property line was set at 4.5 metres by the Board in the initial approval. Although the pole of the Sign meets the required Setback, there was an error during installation that resulted in the east edge of the screen extending into the Setback by approximately 0.3 metres (12 inches). This is evidenced in the survey included on Page 7 of his submission.
- [18] The attached measurement taken with the Google maps measurement tool shows that the Setback from the east edge of the screen to the closest curb line is approximately 23.91 metres (78.45 feet). Although the Setback from the edge of the screen to the property line is deficient by 0.3 metres, the Sign still maintains a significant distance from the roadway, which minimizes the impact of the deficiency. There is no evidence to indicate that there is a safety issue associated with the Sign in its current location. Transportation did not have an objection to the proposed Sign. He directed the Board to Page 8 of his submission.
- [19] In summary, there is a substantial difference between the Grade of the property where the Sign is located and the Grade of the roadway where the Sign is oriented. The Sign does not appear out of place in respect to the Height of other Freestanding Signs and structures in the surrounding area. Reducing the Height of the Sign to 8.0 metres as outlined in the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* would result in a Sign that aesthetically appears too low and would be potentially partially obstructed by vehicles travelling west on 137 Avenue.
- [20] Although there is a deficiency of 0.3 metres in the Setback from the eastern edge of the screen to the property line, the 24.64 metres distance from the curb to the property line reduces the overall impact of this deficiency. No safety concerns have been received regarding the Height of the Sign where it is located or the Setback from the property line.
- [21] The Sign offers a public service element as Astral Out-Of-Home partners with the Alberta Government in broadcasting Amber Alert messages on their Signs across the province. The Amber Alert will replace advertising on the Sign for a period of 2 hours and will repeat itself the following day if the Alert last more than 24 hours.
- [22] In response to a question by the Board, he is agreeable to the conditions outlined in the Development Officer's written submission.
- ii) *Position of the Development Officer, Ms. Noorman*
- [23] A Sign permit cannot be renewed. When a Sign permit expires, a new Development Permit is required and is reviewed as a new permit to take into consideration any changes on the subject property.
- [24] The Height of the Sign is measured from Grade to the top of the structure, not from the adjacent roadways or neighbouring properties.

- [25] The Setback is not measured from curb lines but property lines because there could be a change in the road-right-of-way.
- [26] Conditions imposed on a Development Permit, such as complying with Setbacks, need to be met to ensure a Sign is installed in accordance with the approved plans.
- [27] In response to questions by the Board, she confirmed that no complaints were received prior to the review of the new Development Permit application and that Transportation did not have any concerns with the proposed Sign.

iii) Rebuttal of the Appellant, Mr. Grey

- [28] Mr. Grey agreed that the Height of the Sign is measured from the base of the Sign to the top of the Sign. However, in his opinion, consideration needs to be given to how the Sign appears from where it is viewed.
- [29] In his opinion, although Sustainable Development does not measure Setback from the curb line, the distance to the curb line should be considered when evaluating variances to Setback because this is relevant to the impact of the variance. The Development Permit is for a period of five years and, at the time of renewal, any changes to the curb line can be considered.
- [30] The deficiency in the required Setback was not intentional, this was an error made by the builder. They are now using a different builder.

Decision

- [31] The appeal is ALLOWED and the decision of the Development Authority is REVOKED. The development is GRANTED as applied for to the Development Authority, subject to the following CONDITIONS:
1. The Development Permit will expire on June 29, 2022.
 2. The existing Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Signs shall remain in its current location and configuration.
 3. Ambient light monitors shall automatically adjust the brightness level of the Copy Area based on ambient light conditions. Brightness levels shall not exceed 0.3 footcandles above ambient light conditions when measured from the Sign face at its maximum brightness, between sunset and sunrise, at those times determined by the Sunrise / Sunset calculator from the National Research Council of Canada; (Reference Section 59.2(5)(a))
 4. Brightness level of the Sign shall not exceed 400 nits when measured from the Sign face at its maximum brightness, between sunset and sunrise, at those times determined by the Sunrise/Sunset calculator from the national research Council of Canada; (Reference Section 59.2(5)(b))

5. Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Signs shall have a Message Duration greater than or equal to 6 seconds. (Reference Section 7.9(7))
6. The Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Signs shall be located so that all portions of the Sign and its support structure are completely located within the property and no part of the Sign may project beyond the property lines unless otherwise specified in a Sign Schedule. (Reference Section 59.2(12))
7. The following conditions, in consultation with the Transportation department, shall apply to the proposed Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Sign, in accordance to Section 59.2(11):
 - a. That, should at any time, Transportation Planning and Engineering determine that the sign face contributes to safety concerns, the owner/applicant must immediately address the safety concerns identified by removing the sign, de-energizing the sign, changing the message conveyed on the sign, and/or address the concern in another manner acceptable to Transportation Planning and Engineering.
 - b. That the owner/applicant must provide a written statement of the actions taken to mitigate concerns identified by Transportation Planning and Engineering within 30 days of the notification of the safety concern. Failure to provide corrective action will result in the requirement to immediately remove or de-energize the sign.
 - c. The proposed sign shall be constructed entirely within private property. No portion of the sign shall encroach over/into road right-of-way.

ADVISEMENT:

1. Should the Applicant wish to display video or any form of moving images on the sign, a new Development Application for a major digital sign will be required. At that time, Transportation Services will require a safety review of the sign prior to responding to the application.

[32] In granting the development the following variances to the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* are allowed:

1. The maximum allowable Height of 8.0 metres as per Section 59F.3(6)(b) is varied to allow an excess of 1.45 metres, thereby increasing the maximum allowed to 9.45 metres.
2. The minimum required Setback of 4.5 metres as per Section 340.4(3) and Section 813.4(6)(a) is varied to allow a deficiency of 0.3 metres, thereby decreasing the minimum required to 4.2 metres.

Reasons for Decision

- [33] The proposed Minor Digital On-premises Off-premises Sign is a Discretionary Use in the CB2 General Business Zone.
- [34] There is an existing Sign located on the subject Site that has been in existence for five years. The five-year Development Permit has expired and this appeal concerns an application for a new five-year Development Permit. No changes are proposed to the existing Sign.
- [35] The original Development Permit for the Sign was approved by this Board with a variance granted in the Height due to the differential between the location of the Sign and the Height of the adjacent roadways at 137 Avenue and Manning Drive. The roadways are elevated above the location of the Sign, with the result that the top of the Sign is 7.32 metres above the roadways but is 9.45 metres above its base. As a result, the Sign does not appear overly high when viewed from the roadways, which is the location where most people will see it.
- [36] There are other Freestanding Signs in the immediate area that have a similar Height as the existing Sign, so the Sign does not appear out of place in the neighbourhood.
- [37] The original Development Permit specified that the Sign had to comply with the 4.5-metre Setback requirement. However, although the Sign was constructed with its base outside the Setback, the east edge of the Sign projects 0.3 metres into the Setback. The Board accepts the Appellant's evidence that this was inadvertent.
- [38] There is a distance of almost 24 meters from the east edge Sign to the nearest curb. This considerable distance mitigates the minor encroachment into the Setback.
- [39] As well, significant landscaping has been done around the base of the Sign, which improves its appearance.
- [40] No complaints have been received about the Sign and Transportation does not have any concerns with the location of the Sign.
- [41] No one from the neighbourhood appeared at the hearing or submitted any written material in opposition to the Sign.

[42] Based on the above, it is the opinion of the Board that the proposed development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, nor materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Young", with a large, stylized flourish extending from the end of the name.

Mr. M. Young, Presiding Officer
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Important Information for the Applicant/Appellant

1. This is not a Building Permit. A Building Permit must be obtained separately from the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.
2. Obtaining a Development Permit does not relieve you from complying with:
 - a) the requirements of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*, insofar as those requirements have not been relaxed or varied by a decision of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board,
 - b) the requirements of the *Alberta Safety Codes Act*,
 - c) the *Alberta Regulation 204/207 – Safety Codes Act – Permit Regulation*,
 - d) the requirements of any other appropriate federal, provincial or municipal legislation,
 - e) the conditions of any caveat, covenant, easement or other instrument affecting a building or land.
3. When an application for a Development Permit has been approved by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, it shall not be valid unless and until any conditions of approval, save those of a continuing nature, have been fulfilled.
4. A Development Permit will expire in accordance to the provisions of Section 22 of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw, Bylaw 12800*, as amended.
5. This decision may be appealed to the Alberta Court of Appeal on a question of law or jurisdiction under Section 688 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26. If the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board is served with notice of an application for leave to appeal its decision, such notice shall operate to suspend the Development Permit.
6. When a decision on a Development Permit application has been rendered by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, the enforcement of that decision is carried out by the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.

NOTE: The City of Edmonton does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the City. If you are concerned about the stability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of Edmonton, when issuing a 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 the property.



**EDMONTON
TRIBUNALS**

*Subdivision &
Development
Appeal Board*

10019 – 103 Avenue NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 0G9
P: 780-496-6079 F: 780-577-
3537
sdab@edmonton.ca
edmontonsdab.ca

Date: June 29, 2017
Project Number: 245757727-001
File Number: SDAB-D-17-111

Notice of Decision

- [1] On June 21, 2017, the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the “Board”) heard an appeal that was filed on **May 29, 2017**. The appeal concerned the decision of the Development Authority, issued on May 15, 2017, to approve the following development:

Construct a Secondary Suite in the Basement of an existing Single Detached House (existing without permits) and to construct exterior alterations (increasing window size on rear elevations and new Basement window on side elevation)

- [2] The subject property is on Plan 1452TR Blk 24 Lot 6, located at 4123 - 109 Street NW, within the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone. The Mature Neighbourhood Overlay and the Duggan Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan apply to the subject property.
- [3] The following documents were received prior to the hearing and form part of the record:
- Copy of the Development Permit application with attachments, proposed plans, and the approved Development Permit;
 - The Development Officer’s written submissions; and
 - The Appellant’s Reasons for Appeal.

Preliminary Matters

- [4] At the outset of the appeal hearing, the Presiding Officer confirmed with the parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the panel.
- [5] The appeal was filed on time, in accordance with Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26 (the “*Municipal Government Act*”).
- [6] The Presiding Officer outlined how the hearing would be conducted, including the order of appearance of parties, and no opposition was noted.

[7] The Presiding Officer indicated that the Appellant, Mr. Diepenbeck, was not in attendance at the hearing. The Administrative Staff contacted Mr. Diepenbeck who confirmed that he would not be attending the hearing and would like the Board to proceed based on his written submission.

He subsequently sent confirmation of this by way of email to the Board, which is on file. The Board reviewed and considered the Appellant's written submission in detail.

Summary of Hearing

i) Position of the Development Officer, Mr. McArthur

[8] Mr. McArthur referred the Board to his written submission.

[9] In response to a question, he advised that the Alberta Building Code requires windows of a certain size for egress. A Development Permit application was made for the Secondary Suite in the basement when the property owner was installing windows of the appropriate size.

[10] In response to a question, he advised that the house was a non-conforming building because it did not comply with Section 814.3(5) of the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay (the "MNO"). The house was built in 1973 and the MNO was adopted in 2001. The minimum Rear Setback required by the MNO is 40 percent of the Site Depth. The house has a Rear Setback of 23 percent. In his opinion, adding the windows to the basement will not increase the non-conformity, there are no privacy concerns, and the footprint of the dwelling will not change.

ii) Position of the Respondent, Mr. Whincup, representing Habitat Studio & Workshop Ltd., who was accompanied by Mr. Frohlich, the property owner

[11] Mr. Whincup and Mr. Frohlich did not have anything further to provide to the Board.

Decision

[12] The appeal is DENIED and the decision of the Development Authority is CONFIRMED. The development is GRANTED as approved by the Development Authority.

Reasons for Decision

[13] A Secondary Suite is a Permitted Use in the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone.

[14] The Development Officer indicated that this Secondary Suite did not require any variances. Normally where a Permitted Use has no variances and there are no misinterpretations of the land use bylaw, there is no right of appeal when a Development Permit is issued. (Section 685(3) *Municipal Government Act*)

- [15] However, this Development Permit application was treated as a Discretionary Development because the dwelling is a legal non-conforming building. The Single Detached House was approved in 1973 and the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay was adopted in 2001. Section 814.3(5) of the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay requires a minimum rear Setback of 40 percent of the Site Depth. The Single Detached House on the property has a Rear Setback of only 23 percent of the Site Depth.
- [16] Section 643(5)(c) of the *Municipal Government Act* states that a non-conforming building may not be enlarged, added to, rebuilt or structurally altered except in accordance with a land use bylaw that provides minor variance power to the development authority.
- [17] Section 11.2(2) of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* states that a Development Officer may approve, with or without conditions as a Class B Discretionary Development, an enlargement, alteration, or addition to a non-conforming building if the building complies with the Uses prescribed for the land in the *Bylaw*.
- [18] In this case, the Development Officer exercised that discretion to allow the alterations necessary for the Secondary Suite, including increasing window sizes and creating a new window in the basement. The Board finds that the Development Officer exercised this discretion appropriately. These alterations will not have any impact on the existing non-conformity with respect to the Rear Setback.
- [19] Further, the Board agrees with the Development Officer that the proposed development will not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, nor materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land.
- [20] No letters were received in opposition to the proposed development and no one appeared in opposition at the hearing.
- [21] In the Appellant's written submission, he stated that rental suites in this neighbourhood have an impact on parking, traffic volume, and resale values. The Appellant stated that houses in the neighbourhood were meant for Single Family Dwellings and not multiple families. The Appellant did not attend the hearing to expand on these concerns.
- [22] The Board notes that City Council's intent with regard to the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone was that Secondary Suites are a Permitted Use provided that all the regulations, including those with regard to parking, are adhered to. The proposed development does comply with all applicable regulations.

[23] The Board finds that there is nothing in the Appellant's submission that leads the Board to believe that this particular Secondary Suite development will have a different impact on the neighbourhood than any other Secondary Suite development in this neighbourhood.

[24] Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Young", is centered on the page. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Mr. M. Young, Presiding Officer
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Important Information for the Applicant/Appellant

1. This is not a Building Permit. A Building Permit must be obtained separately from the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.
2. Obtaining a Development Permit does not relieve you from complying with:
 - a) the requirements of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*, insofar as those requirements have not been relaxed or varied by a decision of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board,
 - b) the requirements of the *Alberta Safety Codes Act*,
 - c) the *Alberta Regulation 204/207 – Safety Codes Act – Permit Regulation*,
 - d) the requirements of any other appropriate federal, provincial or municipal legislation,
 - e) the conditions of any caveat, covenant, easement or other instrument affecting a building or land.
3. When an application for a Development Permit has been approved by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, it shall not be valid unless and until any conditions of approval, save those of a continuing nature, have been fulfilled.
4. A Development Permit will expire in accordance to the provisions of Section 22 of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw, Bylaw 12800*, as amended.
5. This decision may be appealed to the Alberta Court of Appeal on a question of law or jurisdiction under Section 688 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26. If the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board is served with notice of an application for leave to appeal its decision, such notice shall operate to suspend the Development Permit.
6. When a decision on a Development Permit application has been rendered by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, the enforcement of that decision is carried out by the Sustainable Development Department, located on the 2nd Floor, Edmonton Tower, 10111 – 104 Avenue NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 0J4.

NOTE: The City of Edmonton does not conduct independent environmental checks of land within the City. If you are concerned about the stability of this property for any purpose, you should conduct your own tests and reviews. The City of Edmonton, when issuing a 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 the property.