

**EDMONTON**  
**COMMUNITY STANDARDS AND LICENCE APPEAL COMMITTEE**

Citation: Applicant v Community Standards and Neighbourhoods (City of Edmonton), 2026 ABECSLAC 10008

Date:	April 23, 2026
Order Number:	580226566-003
CSLAC File Number:	CSLAC-26-008

Between:

Applicant

and

The City of Edmonton, Community Standards and Neighbourhoods

---

Committee Members

Kathy Cherniawsky, Chair  
Allan Bolstad  
Karen Munro

---

DECISION

[1] On April 14, 2026, the Community Standards and Licence Appeal Committee (the “Committee” or “*CSLAC*”) heard a request for review of an Order. The Request for Review concerned the decision of Community Standards and Neighbourhoods to issue an Order pursuant to Section 546(1) of *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26 (the “*Municipal Government Act*” or “*MGA*”). The Order was dated February 18, 2026 and was mailed/posted on February 18, 2026 and required the following action:

YOU ARE THEREFORE ORDERED TO:

Secure your property against unauthorized entry by:

- Re-secure all points of entry on all structures on both the basement and main or first floor levels, including doors, windows and any holes or openings, as well as any point of entry on any upper levels that may be accessible from any potential climbing point in a manner sufficient to prevent unauthorized entry. Please refer

to the attached “Board Up Procedure Bulletin” for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.

- Provide and install/Re-secure security fencing along the property line, providing a continuous barrier around the property. The fencing shall not encroach on municipal or neighbouring properties. Please refer to the attached “Security Fencing Bulletin” for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.
- Providing security guard services to patrol the property no less than once every 6 hours. For each patrol, the security guard will be expected to walk the full perimeter of the property, checking the security fence, structure, and property in general for any signs of breaches. All patrols shall be photographed and documented. Ensure that photographs are taken using a “datestamper” on the photos so it is evident on the photo(s) the date and time of patrol. There shall be a total of 4 patrol package photos within a 24 hour period. Photo packages shall be emailed to the [communitypropertysafetyteam@edmonton.ca](mailto:communitypropertysafetyteam@edmonton.ca) once per day. A failure to comply will result in CPST to intervene and assign a security guard to patrol the property. Please refer to the attached “Security Guard Bulletin” for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.
- Maintain the securement/boarding/re-securement at all times to the standards set out in the Board Up Procedure Bulletin; and
- Immediately rectify any breaches to the securement/boarding/re-securement.

The City may issue a new Order in accordance with the Progressive Security Model (attached) if it is determined that the securement measures outlined above are insufficient or inadequate in preventing unauthorized entry.

**YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER BEFORE: March 12, 2026**

- [2] The subject property is located at 9409 - 91 Street NW, Edmonton.
- [3] The hearing on April 14, 2026 was held through a combination of written submissions and video conference. The following documents were received prior to the hearing and form part of the record:
- Copy of the Order issued pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act*;
  - The Applicant’s written Request for Review and documents; and
  - The Respondent’s written submission, including other evidence.

**Preliminary Matters**

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

- [5] The Chair outlined how the hearing would be conducted, including the order of appearance of parties, and no opposition was noted.
- [6] As a preliminary matter, the Committee reviewed the dates of correspondence on the submitted materials and considered whether the request for review was filed on time, in accordance with Section 547 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

**Summary of Preliminary Matter:**

*i) Position of the Applicant:*

- [7] The established timelines appear correct and he has no additional documentation to provide at this time.
- [8] The Applicant is navigating this process for the first time and intends to move the matter toward a final resolution.
- [9] While the Applicant acknowledges the nature of the rules regarding the late filing, he is seeking a review or potential extensions.
- [10] The Applicant provided the following information in response to questions from the Committee:
- a. The Applicant's primary goal in early correspondence with the issuer was to navigate the appeal process and discover how and where to file an appeal. The timelines lapsed while trying to gather this information.
  - b. The Applicant wanted to appeal as soon as they became aware that an appeal was a valid option. They recalled asking the City/Fire Department directly if there was an option to appeal and requesting information on how to send a written request to the Committee.
  - c. The Applicant did not explicitly state they were appealing the Order in initial communications with the Committee. However, their intent was clear through questions about filing an appeal as they would not have been asking about the process if they did not intend to file the appeal. At the time of the early correspondence, they did not know that an appeal was possible.
  - d. When they sent the email to the Committee on February 23rd asking for the process to appeal, the intent was to start the appeal.
  - e. Despite receiving a reply on February 23, 2026 outlining the timelines, they did not provide the formal dispute and reasons until March 2, 2026.

*ii) Position of the Respondent:*

- [11] The Respondent cannot speak to the email from February 23, 2026 but can speak to conversations with the Applicant on February 19 and 20, 2026. The Respondent instructed the Applicant on the specific steps required to file an appeal.
- [12] The Respondent was responsible for delivering the Order to the party involved and confirmed that they provided the necessary legal sections and screenshots to ensure the recipient was aware of the formal deadlines for action.
- [13] The Respondent provided the following information in response to questions asked from the Committee.
- a. The Respondent had not personally seen the February 23, 2026 email prior to the hearing and therefore could not initially comment on its specific contents. Their only knowledge was based on emails from February 19 and 20, 2026, in which the Applicant was requesting information on the procedure for how to file an appeal.
  - b. After hearing the content of the February 23, 2026 email read aloud, the Respondent said the language was very similar to the earlier February 19th/20th correspondence.
  - c. The Respondent maintained the assumption that the sender was still seeking information on the appeal process rather than submitting a formal, sufficient request for review under the *Municipal Government Act*.

*iii) Rebuttal of the Applicant:*

- [14] The Applicant's agent affirmed that when they sent the email to the Committee on February 23, 2026 asking for the process to appeal, the intent was to start the appeal.

**Decision on Preliminary Matter**

- [15] The Request for Review was filed on time.

**Reasons for Decision on Preliminary Matter**

- [16] This matter involves a request to review an order issued on February 18, 2026 under the authority of section 546 of the *MGA*.
- [17] The relevant portions of section 547(1) of the *MGA* deal with the Applicant's right to request a review of the Order and state:

A person who receives a written order under section 545 or 546 may by written notice request council to review the order within ...(b) 7 days after the date the order is received, in the case of an order under section 546..., or any longer period as specified by bylaw.

[18] No City of Edmonton Bylaw specifies a longer period than 7 days.

[19] After reviewing the written materials, the Committee finds that the following events occurred on the stated dates:

- February 18, 2026: The Order was posted at the subject property and mailed to the registered owners listed on the land title certificate. The Order contains information about how it could be appealed and included the 7 day time line for appeal set in section 547(1) of the *MGA*.
- February 18, 2026: Based on the submitted emails, the Applicant's Agent had actual notice of the Order when they observed the copy of it posted at the subject site as shown in submitted photos. Therefore, the Committee finds the statutory appeal period began to run as of this date.
- February 19, 2026 email exchange:
  - Email from the Applicant's Agent to Respondent acknowledges they have seen the posted Order and asks for it not to be escalated to Phase 3.
  - The Email is answered promptly the same day by the Respondent who acknowledges the breaches have been fixed, but indicates escalation is needed due to the new complaints. The Respondent attached information to explain the technical requirements of a Phase 3 Order.
- February 20, 2026 email exchange:
  - The Applicant's Agent asks if there is any way to appeal and about responsibility and terms in the Order respecting the security guards.
  - The Respondent replies noting appeal information is located near the end of the posted Order and asking if the Applicant has more questions.
  - Applicant's Agent replies indicating he cannot find the information on the technical Bulletin and asking for a link.
  - Respondent replies stating the information on how to appeal is on the last page of the Order and attaching a screenshot of that portion of the Order for the Applicant's reference.
- February 23, 2026 email exchange between Applicant's Agent and CSLAC office:
  - At 12:44 p.m. the Committee received an email from the Applicant's agent stating:

RE 9409 91 Street- Phase 3 appeal

Good Day. I hope you are well. I'm looking to find out the process to appeal site above from phase 3 order. Thank you for your time.

- At 2:16 p.m. (less than two hours later) the Committee office answers by email stating:

Thank you for your email. The Community Standards and Licence Appeal Committee can hear requests for review of orders issued under section 545 and 546 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

There are strict timelines in which to request a review of an order. If it's a *MGA* section 545 order it must be submitted within 14 days. If it's a *MGA* section 546 order it must be submitted within 7 days.

To submit a request for review, please provide us with a copy of the received order, your reasons for the request for review, along with your contact information including mailing address and phone number. Additionally, if you are not the registered owner of the property, we require written authorization from the registered owner that you have been appointed to act on their behalf.

- February 25, 2026: The opportunity to request a review ends 7 days after the Order was actually received by the Applicant on February 18, 2026 when the posted Order was viewed by the Applicant's Agent.
- March 2, 2026: Committee receives Applicant's Agent email attaching the Order, stating this is the order they wish to dispute, and seeking an "extension of the 7 days." The email also includes written authorization from the Applicant corporation and reasons for request.

[20] Based on the written correspondence and the oral submission by the Applicant's Agent, the Committee finds a written request for review was filed with the committee in time in accordance with section 547(1) of the *MGA* in this case for the following reasons:

- a) The email received on February 23, 2026 is somewhat unclear, but it shows the intention to appeal the Order and includes enough information to identify which Order the Applicant's agent is referencing and seeking to review, including:
  - i) The address of the subject property.
  - ii) The reference to a phase 3 order which can only apply to an order issued under section 546 of the *MGA*.
- b) The written email chain and the oral submissions of the Applicant's Agent support the fact that in this case that the Applicant had a clear and unwavering intention to request a review of the Order beginning on February 18, 2026 and expressed it in the email received by the Committee on February 23, 2026.

[21] The Committee notes that the Applicant's email of March 2, 2026 purports to request an extension of the 7 day appeal period prescribed in section 547 of the *MGA*. For clarity,

the Committee has no authority whatsoever to extend the number of days in section 547(2).

- [22] This Committee has decided based on all submissions before it in this review, that the February 23, 2026 email was sufficient to satisfy the requirement of a written request to review the Order within the 7 day statutory window.

**Summary of Review of the Order on the Merits:**

*iv) Position of the Applicant:*

- [23] The Applicant is seeking an extension to complete the project and finalize the demolition of the house to resolve the issue permanently.
- [24] Active steps have been taken to demolish the building including completing the abatement process, securing EPCOR permits for electrical and water. They are currently waiting on the demolition permits to proceed.
- [25] To address concerns about the property's current state, the Applicant offers to increase site inspections from a weekly basis to every 72 hours (or as requested) to ensure there are no further unauthorized entries in the property.
- [26] The Applicant provided the following information in response to questions from the Committee:
- a. They are seeking a one-month extension to the current order to complete the demolition of the house. The main goal is to prevent the property from moving into a progressive security model (Phase 3 Order), which includes mandatory professional security patrols.
  - b. They do not object to securing entry points; all points of entry have been and continue to be secured after any breaches.
  - c. They do not object to the requirement for security fencing, but are already in compliance as fencing is currently installed.
  - d. They do not object to maintaining the boarding to Fire Department standards or rectifying breaches immediately.
  - e. They object to the requirement for a security guard to patrol every 6 hours with photo documentation citing the cost and argue that current efforts are acceptable under the circumstances. They offered to increase their own site visits to once every 48 to 72 hours rather than using a professional service.
  - f. The demolition they had promised in early March has not yet occurred because ATCO had to disconnect the gas line. The final demolition permit application to the City has not been filed because it requires the ATCO disconnection to be completed

- first. Given the time it takes for permit processing and contractor mobilization they estimate the house can be demolished and the rubbish removed 1–2 weeks after the permit is issued.
- g. They believe one month is a cushioned timeframe to reach a vacant land state.
  - h. Some intruders are very resourceful and determined. Some use saws to cut through half-inch plywood, while others simply try to kick things in.
  - i. Drug paraphernalia was found inside, but he does not believe anyone is currently living there.
  - j. A neighbour is very diligent in reporting activity to the authorities. They clarified that a previous report of stealing power was EPCOR workers removing the meter.
  - k. There have been no recent breaches since adding steel behind the plywood to prevent saws from sawing through.
- v) *Position of the Respondent:*
- [27] The property owner consistently failed to meet requirements across multiple stages of the Order. Phase 1 was not compliant despite extra time being granted, and Phase 2 was ignored entirely, forcing the City to intervene and secure the site themselves.
- [28] Because previous attempts to secure the property were unsuccessful or breached, professional security is now a mandatory requirement for Phase 3 of the Order.
- [29] There are multiple complainants expressing safety concerns regarding the property.
- [30] Citydata/files show that having an individual on-site (security) acts as a necessary deterrent, and this security must be professional rather than informal to be effective. This is the City's standard procedure for high-risk or repeatedly non-compliant properties.
- [31] The Respondent provided the following information in response to questions asked from the Committee:
- a. There was a report of the smell of smoke inside the house. The Respondent noted that community members often fear that people entering vacant houses will start fires that could spread to the entire neighbourhood.
  - b. They confirmed that an extension cord looped from a neighbour's property is a significant fire hazard. Extension cords are intended for temporary use only, not permanent power. The City cannot verify what is powered by the cord, which increases the risk of fire inside the house.
  - c. They are against substituting a professional security guard with 48-hour checks by the property owner because professional security firms provide reports and 360-degree

- photos of the property every 24 hours; the City cannot independently confirm if a property owner is actually securing the site unless they perform their own inspections; and 48-hour gaps between checks is too long. Security guards check every 6 hours throughout a 24-hour period, including overnight when activity is typically higher. Longer intervals provide ample time for unauthorized individuals to enter the property.
- d. The City's policy is to escalate to the next phase of security as soon as a breach of the property is discovered (as happened on February 18, 2026).
  - e. Once the property is demolished, the City takes photos for their file and notifies Bylaw the security/monitoring order is no longer in effect; and the City instructs its fencing contractors to remove the temporary fencing.
  - f. Because the property owner did not comply with orders to provide their own fencing, the City provided its own via a City contractor. If the fence is breached, the City contacts the fencing company to fix it. All costs associated with the City's fencing contract and repairs are charged back to the property's tax roll. The property owner cannot contact the fencing company directly as the contract is in the City's name.
- vi) *Rebuttal of the Applicant:*
- [32] The team can provide documentation (specifically 360-degree photos with date stamps) that is equal to or better than the current security company's. They propose a 48-hour turnaround for submitting site inspection photos to ensure all due diligence requirements are met internally.
  - [33] The Applicant doubts the effectiveness of the third-party security company: that type of company likely hires low-wage labour who may not be as thorough or reputable as the Applicant.
  - [34] The site's fencing is currently being breached and they have repaired it in the interim. There is a lack of clarity regarding who owns or is responsible for the security fencing.
  - [35] The Applicant provided the following information in response to questions from the Committee:
    - a. They acknowledged that they assumed that the fencing responsibilities were not theirs. The information regarding the fence ownership or responsibility is new to him.
    - b. However, their team has been proactive in re-securing the fence themselves, acting under the impression it was their duty to do so. They are committed to investigating the matter further to clarify these responsibilities moving forward.

**Decision**

[36] **The Request for Review is ALLOWED IN PART. The Order is AMENDED as follows (changes bolded and underlined):**

YOU ARE THEREFORE ORDERED TO:

Secure your property against unauthorized entry by:

- Re-secure all points of entry on all structures on both the basement and main or first floor levels, including doors, windows and any holes or openings, as well as any point of entry on any upper levels that may be accessible from any potential climbing point in a manner sufficient to prevent unauthorized entry. Please refer to the attached “Board Up Procedure Bulletin” for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.
- Provide and install/Re-secure security fencing along the property line, providing a continuous barrier around the property. The fencing shall not encroach on municipal or neighbouring properties. Please refer to the attached “Security Fencing Bulletin” for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.
- Maintain the securement/boarding/re-securement at all times to the standards set out in the Board Up Procedure Bulletin; and
- Immediately rectify any breaches to the securement/boarding/re-securement.

**YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE PROVISIONS BEGINNING: MARCH 12, 2026.**

- **Patrolling the property no less than once every 48 hours and for each patrol, walking the full perimeter of the property, checking the security fence, structure, and property in general for any signs of breaches. All patrols shall be photographed and documented. Ensure that photographs are taken using a “datestamper” on the photos so it is evident on the photo(s) the date and time of patrol. There shall be a total of 1 patrol package containing these photos within a 48 hour period. A photo package shall be emailed to the communitypropertysafetyteam@edmonton.ca no less than every 48 hours. A failure to comply will result in CPST intervening and assigning a security guard to patrol the property.**

**YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE PROVISION BEGINNING APRIL 14, 2026 UNTIL MAY 15, 2026.**

- Providing security guard services to patrol the property no less than once every 6 hours. For each patrol, the security guard will be expected to walk the full perimeter of the property, checking the security fence, structure, and property in general for any signs of breaches. All patrols shall be photographed and documented. Ensure that photographs are taken using a “datestamper” on the

photos so it is evident on the photo(s) the date and time of patrol. There shall be a total of 4 patrol package photos within a 24 hour period. Photo packages shall be emailed to the [communitypropertysafetyteam@edmonton.ca](mailto:communitypropertysafetyteam@edmonton.ca) once per day. A failure to comply will result in CPST to intervene and assign a security guard to patrol the property. Please refer to the attached "Security Guard Bulletin" for the detailed requirements that must be met for compliance.

**YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE PROVISION BEGINNING MAY 16, 2026.**

The City may issue a new Order in accordance with the Progressive Security Model (attached) if it is determined that the securement measures outlined above are insufficient or inadequate in preventing unauthorized entry.

**Reasons for Decision**

- [37] After reviewing the Order and all submissions, the Committee has decided in accordance with section 547(2) of the *MGA* to vary the terms of the Order as noted above and to confirm the remainder of the Order for the following reasons:
- a) While the Applicant failed to comply with the terms of the Phase 2 Order issued October 2, 2025, which required the City to intervene and provide upgraded boarding and fencing in November 2025, the Applicant has stepped in since that time to provide increased security and maintenance at the subject site.
  - b) The Committee heard that the Applicant's Agents have been conducting regular visits to the property and providing repairs to the security fencing and securing any damage they observed as needed.
  - c) Since the Phase 2 security measures were added by the City in November, 2025, there had been no further incidents documented at the subject site up until February 13, 2026.
  - d) Due to its regular inspections of the subject property, the Applicant's Agent was aware of the Order the day it was issued and promptly addressed the situation.
  - e) The Applicant's Agent provided evidence that they are actively working to resolve the situation permanently by obtaining necessary permits to have the utilities disconnected and the structures demolished which will effectively conclude the matter. They told the Committee that they expect this will be done in one month from the date of the hearing (May 14, 2026).
  - f) The requirement added by the Committee will increase the Applicant's obligation to actively and regularly inspect the subject property on a more frequent basis and will make the Applicant accountable to document and provide evidence of that ongoing

surveillance for a short period of time during which they will complete the demolition approval process and carry out the demolition.

- g) Under the varied Order, if the Applicant fails to meet this increased surveillance and reporting requirement imposed by the Committee, then the full Phase 3 provisions suggested by the Respondent will come into force immediately.
- h) Furthermore, if the Applicant fails to procure all of the necessary permits, and to carry out the demolition, then the enhanced surveillance and reporting requirements suggested by the Respondent will come into force on May 16, 2026 and continue until such time as the demolition is completed.

[38] For the above reasons, the Order is confirmed subject to the varied provisions noted above.

Kathy Cherniawsky, Chair  
Community Standards and Licence Appeal Committee

**Important Information for the Applicant**

1. A person affected by this decision may appeal to the Alberta Court of King's Bench under Section 548 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26 if the procedure required to be followed by this Act is not followed, or the decision is patently unreasonable.