

# **Edmonton Subdivision and Development Appeal Board**

Churchill Building  
10019 - 103 Avenue NW  
Edmonton, AB T5J 0G9  
Phone: 780-496-6079 Fax: 780-577-3537  
Email: sdab@edmonton.ca  
Web: www.edmontonsdab.ca

Date: October 9, 2015  
Project Number: 176139202-001  
File Number: SDAB-D-15-215

## **Notice of Decision**

This appeal dated September 1, 2015, from the decision of the Development Authority for permission to:

Operate a Major Home Based Business (Big Glamour Exchange - consignment clothing business)

on Plan 9722099 Blk 6 Lot 76, located at 390 - Blackburn Drive East SW, was heard by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board on September 24, 2015.

### **Summary of Hearing:**

At the outset of the appeal hearing, the Chair confirmed with the parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the panel.

The appeal was filed on time, in accordance with Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26.

The Board heard an appeal of the decision of the Development Authority to approve an application to Operate a Major Home Based Business (Big Glamour Exchange - consignment clothing business) located at 390 Blackburn Drive East SW. The subject site is zoned RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone and is within the Blackburne Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan.

The development permit application was approved with conditions and was subsequently appealed by an adjacent property owner.

Prior to the hearing the following information was provided to the Board, copies of which are on file:

- A written submission from the Appellant received with the original appeal and an additional written submission from the Appellant was received on September 18, 2015;
- A copy of the Development Permit Application documentation;
- A copy of the Blackburne Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan; and
- One web response in opposition to the development from an affected property owner.

The Board heard from the Appellants, Ms. E. Panas and Mr. G. Banks, who provided the following information to the Board:

1. They have concerns regarding traffic, parking and changes to the character of the neighbourhood.
2. The neighbourhood is very residential in nature and the home based business is 1 ½ kilometers away from the nearest convenience store.
3. There is one access road into the neighbourhood which is used primarily by local residents to travel in and out of the area.
4. They are concerned about how this business is advertised. The website does not mention “by appointment only” and says “come visit us”. The hours of operation listed on the website changed after the appeal was filed. Originally, the website indicated the business operated on Saturdays but now it shows weekdays only from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
5. They feel this business is more of a retail operation than appointment based.
6. Prior to this appeal, the Driveway was used for parking by the residents. The Garage has since been cleaned to allow room for parking in the Garage but the residents still have large vehicles parked on the street.
7. This is a quiet neighbourhood and there seems to be a lack of concern for the neighbours as there have been noise related bylaw issues.
8. Other residents in the neighbourhood are not particularly enthusiastic about this business, but are taking a wait-and-see attitude.
9. The Applicant rents the home, and the property owner was not aware of the home based business.

Ms. Panas and Mr. Banks provided the following responses to questions:

1. The four permitted visits per day would be noticeable due to the road configuration. Blackburn Drive West is a collector road. However, Blackburn Drive East, on which the subject property exists, is just a local road and the business is located near the centre of it.
2. The additional traffic generated by this business would be beyond the level expected or typical of this neighbourhood.
3. They are concerned that enforcement of the conditions of the permit will fall to the residents of the neighbourhood.
4. They have experienced previous belligerent, uncooperative behaviour from the residents.
5. There are mannequins on display in the front window.
6. They did not have any pictures to illustrate the parking situation in the neighbourhood but stated the Respondent has large vehicles parked on the street that do not fit inside the Garage.
7. There is typically only one street parking space per house in this neighbourhood as most homes have front attached Garages.
8. The Blackburne Creek Homeowner’s Association does advocacy work in their area and has therefore provided a letter outlining their concerns.

The Board heard from Ms. F. Hamilton, representing the City of Edmonton’s Sustainable Development Department, who provided the following responses to questions:

1. She provided her interpretation of the terms “General Retail Stores” and “Second Hand Stores”. She felt the proposed development is not typical of a store as there is no drop-in

business and people do not come to shop and browse. Sales are typically done online and visits would only occur if people want to try on clothing before making a purchase.

2. The number of visits permitted per day is limited and cannot overlap.
3. She understands that the clothes for sale belong to the Applicant or are from people she knows. In the future, Ms. Salles would like to expand her business to a retail Use, but she would like to start out in her home.
4. Traffic generated is not beyond what is typical of the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone. Visits would be short (approximately half an hour per visit) and not overlapping. There would only be one additional car at the dwelling for very short periods of time.
5. The proposed development has a mid-block location, visits must be by appointment, only a small sign is permitted, the business looks like a house rather than a store, and clothing is delivered via courier to minimize outside visits. All of these factors help to maintain the residential character of the area.
6. There is a condition on the permit which states there is to be no external display other than a small sign. She was not aware of a display mannequin in the front window.

The Board heard from the Respondent, Ms. N. Salles, who provided the following information to the Board:

1. She submitted a presentation to the Board which was marked Exhibit "A".
2. She spoke about family problems and the need to supplement her income. She has chosen this type of home based business due to her interest in clothing and because she could easily run it from her home. She sells only high end clothing.
3. She loves this neighbourhood and intends to maintain its residential character.
4. Her business does not disturb the neighbours or alter the character of the neighbourhood. She uses UPS to minimize outside visits.
5. The property is located 10 houses from a bus stop, and 6 school buses travel on the road each day, so a fair amount of pedestrian and vehicle traffic already exists.
6. She is unable to change her website at this time but intends to comply with all conditions of the permit.
7. Her business is not a store with an open door because she has other obligations during the day.

Ms. Salles provided the following responses to questions:

1. There seems to be a fair amount of traffic around and through the neighbourhood, and she does not feel her business will have a negative impact.
2. She confirmed she has one mannequin which is not intended to be used as an advertising display and cannot be seen very easily from the street. She uses the mannequin to brainstorm ideas for how to put outfits together. She is willing to move the mannequin.
3. There is not much impact on the neighbours as her business operates during the day when most people are at work or at school.

In rebuttal, Ms. Panas and Mr. Banks made the following points:

1. They do notice an impact upon traffic and parking in the neighbourhood.

2. There could possibly be more than four visits per day.
3. The proposed development is leaning more towards General Retail Stores since the intention is to grow the business.
4. It is a coincidence that the noise coming from the property has recently lessened since Ms. Salle's husband started a new job.
5. Health issues are irrelevant to this appeal as everyone has to deal with them.
6. Since the website can be edited, they continue to have concerns about the hours of operation.
7. Ms. Panas described an uncomfortable experience she has had with a home-based business (a hairdresser) in another location in the City, and found it did have a negative impact on the neighbourhood.

**Decision:**

The appeal is DENIED and the decision of the Development Authority is CONFIRMED. The development is GRANTED as applied for to the Development Authority, subject to the following CONDITIONS:

1. The Development Permit is approved for a period of 5 years and will expire on October 10, 2020.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Board finds the following:

1. This is an application for a Major Home Based Business being the consignment and sale of used clothing from the applicant's residence. A Major Home Based Business is a Discretionary Use in the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone as per Section 110.3(7) of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*.
2. The first line of analysis undertaken by the Board was to determine whether or not the development applied for is in fact a Major Home Based Business. Section 7.3(7) of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* defines a Major Home Based Business as follows:

**Major Home Based Business** means development consisting of the use of an approved Dwelling or Accessory building by a resident of that Dwelling for one or more businesses such businesses may generate more than one business associated visit per day. The business use must be secondary to the residential Use of the building and shall not change the residential character of the Dwelling or Accessory building. The Dwelling may be used as a workplace by a non-resident. This Use Class includes Bed and Breakfast Operations but does not include General Retail Sales.

The Board is satisfied that the applied for Use of selling second hand clothing will be secondary to the residential Use of the building, and will not change the residential character of the primary building or any accessory buildings located on the site.

3. The only issue remaining was whether or not the proposed development would be a “General Retail Stores” Use, which is specifically excluded from the definition of a Major Home Based Business. Section 7.4(22) of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* defines “General Retail Stores” as follows:

**General Retail Stores** means development used for the retail or consignment sale of new goods or merchandise within an enclosed building, not including the sale of gasoline, heavy agricultural and industrial equipment, alcoholic beverages, or goods sold wholesale. Accessory Uses may include the assembly or repair of products sold on Site, or minor public services such as postal services or pharmacies. This Use Class does not include Aircraft Sales/Rentals, Automotive and Minor Recreation Vehicle Sales/Rentals, Flea Market, Gas Bars, Greenhouses, Plant Nurseries and Market Gardens, Pawn Stores, Major Alcohol Sales, Minor Alcohol Sales, Major Service Stations, Minor Service Stations, Secondhand Stores, and Warehouse Sales.

The Board heard the submissions from the Development Officer that she did not consider the proposed development to be a store, given that it did not have the traditional structure, size, or display mechanisms of conventional retailers. The Board further notes that the definition of General Retail Stores is limited to the sale or consignment of new goods. In this case, the applicant is not selling new goods.

4. Furthermore the definition of General Retail Stores specifically excludes Secondhand Stores. Secondhand Stores are defined in Section 7.4(46) of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw* as follows:

**Secondhand Stores** means development used for the retail or consignment sale of secondhand personal or household goods, including the minor repair of goods sold on-Site. Typical Uses include clothing, jewelry, book and antique stores. This Use Class does not include the sale of used vehicles, recreation craft or construction and industrial equipment, and does not include Flea Markets or Pawn Stores.

Therefore, even if this development could be described as a store despite the submissions of the Development Officer, it still would not be considered a General Retail Store as the development clearly falls within the definition of a Secondhand Store.

5. Accordingly, the exclusion of General Retail Sales from the definition of Major Home Based Business is not triggered, and the Board finds that this development is a Major Home Based Business.
6. It then fell to the Board to determine whether the proposed use is compatible with existing Uses in the adjacent area as Major Home Based Businesses are a Discretionary Use within the RF1 Single Detached Residential Zone. The Board conducted its analysis of whether or not this Discretionary Use was appropriate in conjunction with the regulations set out in Section 75 of the *Edmonton Zoning Bylaw*, which outlines the will of Council with respect to Major Home Based Businesses.

7. The proposed development complies with the objective criteria set out in Section 75. These criteria were added as conditions of the Permit by the Development Authority. The Board then turned its attention to those criteria in Section 75 which require some subjective analysis and the exercise of this Board's discretion, namely:
  - a) The criteria stipulated under Section 75(3), which states: "the Major Home Based Business shall not generate pedestrian or vehicular traffic, or parking, in excess of that which is characteristic of the Zone in which it is located". In the Board's opinion, this criteria has been met for the following reasons:
    - i. The Board heard the concerns of the Appellants with respect to increased traffic. The Board acknowledges that there will be some increase in traffic caused by permitting this Major Home Based Business.
    - ii. However, the subject property is located along a straight portion of Blackburne Drive East SW, which minimizes the potential on-street parking problems and traffic congestion that could be occasioned by the traffic increase. Had the property been located on a cul de sac, there may have been more concerns.
    - iii. The Board therefore finds that the development will not generate traffic in excess of that which is characteristic of the area and zone, nor will such increase in traffic affect the amenities of this neighbourhood.
  - b) The criteria stipulated under Section 75(9), which states: "the Major Home Based Business shall not be allowed if, in the opinion of the Development Officer, such Use would be more appropriately located in a Commercial or Industrial Zone having regard for the overall compatibility of the Use with the residential character of the area." In the Board's opinion, this criteria has been met for the following reasons:
    - i. The Board heard the concerns of the Appellants that a mannequin could be seen through a window of the residence which may be indicative of a window display. The Board reminds the Applicant that Condition 5 of the Permit forbids exterior display or advertisement other than a small plaque, and that any window display in the nature of advertisement, or otherwise, is prohibited by this Permit.
    - ii. The Board has added a further condition to the Permit limiting the duration of this Development Permit to five years. The Board has added this condition because the applicant provided evidence to the Board that she plans to grow her business, and in the future potentially expand the business to the sale of new garments obtained directly from manufacturers or distributors. Such a change in the nature of the Major Home Based Business would be an increase in the intensity of the Use of the subject site that would require the potential re-visiting of this Discretionary Use by the Development Authority.
    - iii. The above conditions ensure that the proposed development remains compatible with the residential character of the area.

8. For the above reasons, 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.
9. The appeal is denied.

### **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 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, 10250 – 101 Street, Edmonton.
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*, RSA 2000, c S-1;
  - c) the requirements of the *Permit Regulation*, Alta Reg 204/2007;
  - d) the requirements of any other appropriate federal, provincial or municipal legislation; and
  - 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 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 5th Floor, 10250 – 101 Street, Edmonton.

*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.*

Mr. Ian Wachowicz, Chair  
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board



## ***Edmonton Subdivision and Development Appeal Board***

Churchill Building  
10019 - 103 Avenue NW  
Edmonton, AB T5J 0G9  
Phone: 780-496-6079 Fax: 780-577-3537  
Email: sdab@edmonton.ca  
Web: www.edmontonsdab.ca

Date: October 9, 2015  
Project Number: 149159648-001  
File Number: SDAB-D-15-161

### **Notice of Decision**

This appeal dated June 29, 2015, from the decision of the Development Authority for permission to:

Construct 4 Dwellings of Row Housing with attached Garages and to demolish the existing Single Detached House and rear detached Garage

on Plan 4874HW Blk 12 Lot 1, located at 15104 - 110 Avenue NW, was heard by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board on July 22, 2015 and September 24, 2015.

#### **July 22, 2015 Hearing:**

##### **Motion:**

“With the consent of the parties this matter is tabled to September 23 or 24, 2015, to give the Appellant the opportunity to present evidence regarding the late filing issue”.

#### **September 24, 2015 Hearing:**

##### **Motion:**

“That SDAB-D-15-161 be raised from the Table”.

##### **Summary of Hearing:**

At the outset of the appeal hearing, the Chair introduced the panel members.

Mr. C. Thomas, one of the Board members, disclosed that he had previously worked with Mr. J. Angeles, who was representing the City of Edmonton’s Sustainable Development Department at the September 24, 2015 hearing. Mr. Hammermeister of Graphtec Design & Consulting disclosed he has had previous dealings with Mr. Thomas but has always found him to be fair and professional. Mr. Hammermeister had no objections to Mr. Thomas sitting as a member of the quorum.

The Chair confirmed with the parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the panel.

This appeal is from the decision of the Development Authority to refuse an application to construct 4 Dwellings of Row Housing with attached Garages and to demolish the existing Single Detached House and rear detached Garage located at 15104 – 110 Avenue NW. The subject site is zoned RF3 Small Scale Infill Development Zone and is within the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay.

The development permit was refused due to a deficiency in the minimum required Rear Setback, a deficiency in the minimum required dimension for any Private Outdoor Amenity Area, a deficiency in the number of required parking spaces, and the proposed Row Housing showing multiple windows facing the adjacent Site which will interfere with the privacy and enjoyment of the neighbouring property.

Prior to the hearing the following information was provided to the Board, copies of which are on file:

- A copy of a Canada Post registered mail delivery confirmation;
- A Memorandum from the City of Edmonton Transportation Services Department dated March 12, 2015;
- A letter of opposition from a neighbouring property owner; and
- A written submission from Graphtec Design and Consulting received on July 22, 2015

The Chair first addressed the issue of jurisdiction and whether the appeal was filed within the allowable 14-day appeal period, pursuant to Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26 (the "MGA").

The Board heard from Mr. E. Hammermeister of Graphtec Design and Consulting, who was representing the Appellant, Mr. A. Abdulhadi. He provided the following information regarding the late filing issue.

1. He advised that the two partners involved with the proposed development were unable to attend the hearing. One of the partners could not attend because of a religious holiday taking place at mid-day on the same day.
2. He submitted Exhibit A, a letter from Mr. Abdulhadi's employer, Rockhard Contractors Inc., which stated that Mr. Abdulhadi was consistently out of the Edmonton area from March 30, 2015 to June 26, 2015.
3. Mr. Hammermeister was shown the Canada Post registered mail delivery document with a signature indicating that the correspondence was received on May 19, 2015.
4. He could not confirm that the signature was Mr. Abdulhadi's, and did not have any documents containing his client's signature. The Chair reviewed the file and found Mr. Abdulhadi's signature on the appeal intake form.
5. At this time Mr. E. Hammermeister made a formal request for an adjournment.

The Board heard from the Development Officer, Mr. Joselito Angeles, who provided the following information regarding the late filing issue:

1. The first Notice of Refusal that was mailed out was returned as it was sent to an incorrect address.
2. He had a telephone conversation with Mr. Abdulhadi sometime before May 13, 2015, and confirmed the correct mailing address as 8629 – 177A Street. A second letter containing the Notice of Refusal was sent to this address on May 13, 2015, via registered mail, and subsequently delivered and signed for on May 19, 2015.
3. He communicated on several occasions with Mr. Abdulhadi via telephone and e-mail, and advised him that his application would be refused. He could not recall if specific reasons for the refusal were provided.
4. Upon reviewing his file, Mr. Angeles provided a copy of an e-mail to the Appellant, dated October 30, 2014, outlining the deficiencies contained in his submitted drawings (“Exhibit B”).
5. He had no objections to the adjournment request and would try to make himself available.

The Board heard from Ms. V. Haggith and Ms. J. Haggith, affected property owners, regarding the Adjournment Request:

1. They believe the Appellants’ non-attendance is a delay tactic, and do not agree with an adjournment.

Mr. Hammermeister made the following points in rebuttal:

1. This application has been in the works for 1 ½ years and there have been three separate Development Officers on the file. Adjustments have been made to the drawings from the onset.
2. He received a call from the Appellant in June 2015, a day prior to the appeal being filed, asking for help with the verbiage of the appeal. He did indicate to his client that the appeal had to be filed within a 14 day period.
3. There is no intent to delay the appeals process.

Upon reviewing Exhibit B, Mr. C. Thomas, one of the Board members, recused himself from the hearing as he was a Development Officer with the City of Edmonton in October 2014, and may be in potential conflict. He took no part in the deliberation, discussion, or decision with respect to this appeal.

### **Decision Regarding the Request for Adjournment**

The request for an adjournment is denied.

### **Reasons for the Decision:**

1. The Board has denied the request for a further adjournment of this matter. This appeal was originally scheduled before the Board on July 22, 2015. At that time, the representative of the

Appellant, with the consent of all parties, agreed to move the appeal to either September 23 or September 24, 2015, specifically for the purpose of gathering evidence on the issue of the late filing.

2. The Board has heard evidence that Mr. A. Abdulhadi is personally unable to attend today's hearing due to a religious observance. The Board accepts that submission; however, Mr. Abdulhadi has decided to be represented by his consultant, Mr. Hammermeister. It was open to Mr. Abdulhadi, despite his personal unavailability, to provide whatever evidence he has with respect to the late filing matter through his agent. In fact, through his agent, he has been able to provide:
  - a) A letter from Rockhard Contractors Inc. dated September 23, 2015; and
  - b) Information with respect to his telephone conversation with Mr. Hammermeister a few days prior to the filing of this appeal, as outlined above.
3. The Appellant, regardless of personal ability to attend, has had two months to gather evidence on the issue of late filing and have that information presented, through his Representative, who is in attendance. He has in fact done so.
4. The Board notes the objection to the adjournment request by Mr. and Mrs. Haggith, who are the immediate adjacent neighbours and are therefore an affected party.
5. For these reasons, the request for an adjournment is denied.

### **Decision Regarding Jurisdiction**

The Board does not assume jurisdiction pursuant to Section 686 of the MGA.

### **Reasons for the Decision:**

1. Before taking jurisdiction, the Board must decide if the appeal was filed within the timelines as outlined in Section 686(1)(a)(i) of the MGA, which states:

**686(1)** A development appeal to a subdivision and development appeal board is commenced by filing a notice of the appeal, containing reasons, with the board within 14 days,

(a) in the case of an appeal made by a person referred to in section 685(1), after

(i) the date on which the person is notified of the order or decision or the issuance of the development permit,

...

The Board must embark on an inquiry to determine the date on which the Appellant was notified of the decision of the Development Authority.

2. The first point of evidence considered was the evidence of the Development Officer who indicated that he first sent out his decision two to three days after April 10, 2015. This correspondence was returned as it had been sent to an incorrect address. He contacted the Appellant shortly before May 13, 2015, and spoke to him at that time. The Board accepts and finds that in that telephone conversation, the Appellant confirmed his correct address

and that on May 13, 2015, the Development Authority re-mailed its decision to the correct address by way of registered mail.

3. The Board also notes that in this telephone conversation, the Appellant was made aware that his application had been refused.
4. The Board then considered the Canada Post notification of May 20, 2015, which indicates that the registered mail was picked up by A ABDULLAH on May 19, 2015, and includes an electronic facsimile of a signature.
5. The Board did not hear any expert evidence with respect to that signature. The Board does have a verified signature of the Appellant at the bottom of the appeal intake form and has compared the two signatures.
6. The Board cannot determine conclusively that the two signatures were made by the one person, both because no expert provided evidence on that point and because the signatures do not appear to be identical to a layman. However, the Board does note that the signatures do not appear so different that it would be obvious that they were not made by the same person.
7. Although the signatory name was A ABDULLAH on the Canada Post form and the name of the Appellant on the appeal documents is Ali Abdulhadi, the Board notes that Mr. Hammermeister referred to the Appellant several times throughout the hearing as “Mr. Abdullah”. The Board also notes that on the application form, the Appellant’s name is styled in yet a third way as Ali Abdulhadi Ali.
8. Given the fact that the registered mail was sent to an address confirmed by the Appellant, and given the similarities in both the signatory name and the facsimile of the signature on the Canada Post Document, as well as the potential variances in the name of the Appellant, the Board finds, after weighing this evidence, that it is more likely than not that the Appellant received and signed for the package containing the notification of the refusal on May 19, 2015, which included the reasons for the refusal.
9. The Board considered very seriously the letter from Rockhard Contractors Inc. presented by the Appellant. This letter stated that the Appellant was working in Whitecourt “consistently” from March 30, 2015 to June 26, 2015. The Board notes that the word “consistently” was used and not the word “continuously” or any other word that would unequivocally state that the plaintiff did not leave Whitecourt from March 30, 2015 to June 26, 2015. A person could be working “consistently” in Whitecourt while still coming back to Edmonton occasionally throughout that period.
10. The Board notes that the Appellant had a valid reason for not attending today’s hearing in person; however, as the Appellant knew about today’s hearing and the need to provide evidence a full two months ago on the point of late filing, it was open to the Appellant to provide a written submission to the Board stating unequivocally that he did not receive the package signed for on May 19, 2015. The Board therefore finds that an adverse inference may be drawn from the lack of evidence on this point.
11. As a result, the Board finds that the appeal period expired 14 days after May 19, 2015, which means the appeal period expired on June 2, 2015. This appeal was filed on June 29, 2015, and was therefore filed outside the time limit prescribed under Section 686 of the MGA. The Board therefore does not have jurisdiction over this appeal.

**Important Information for the Applicant/Appellant**

1. 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.
2. 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 5th Floor, 10250 – 101 Street, Edmonton.

Mr. Ian Wachowicz, Chair  
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board