



CITY OF FORT SASKATCHEWAN
**LEGISLATIVE
SERVICES**

10005 102 Street, Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta T8L 2C5
780.992.6200 | legislativeservices@fortsask.ca

October 1, 2026

Kirk Gartner
2 Vale Terrace
Fort Saskatchewan, AB T8L 0B1

**NOTICE OF DECISION OF THE
SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD**

FILE NO: **PLRES20260592**

APPEAL: **Development Permit Refusal**

LAND USE DESIGNATION: **RE- Residential Estate Lot District**

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: **Lot 26, Block 05, Plan 062 9672**

CIVIC ADDRESS: **211 Greenfield Way, Fort Saskatchewan, AB, T8L 0B3**

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL filed with the City of Fort Saskatchewan (the “City”) Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the “Board”) pursuant to Section 686 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26 (the “MGA”). The Appeal Hearing was held on September 17, 2026, in Council Chambers of City Hall.

**It is the decision of the Board that the Appeal is GRANTED, and
Development Permit PLRES20260592 is ISSUED.**

BEFORE:

Board Members:

Birgit Blizzard – Chair
Barb Aitken
Wayne Sims

Administration:

Rachelle Gilbert - Clerk for the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board
Iryna Kennedy – Legislative Services

PARTIES PRESENT AND PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

For the Appellant / Applicant:

Kirk Gartner and Angela McCormick: Property Owners (the “Appellant”).

For the Respondent:

Dean McCartney – Manager, Development Planning (the “Development Authority”)

Speaking in support of the Appeal:

There were no additional presentations.

Speaking in opposition to the Appeal:

There were no additional presentations.

Proceedings:

1. The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal to the Board following the Development Authority’s refusal of a Development Permit application for property legally described as Lot 26, Block 05, Plan 062 9672 and municipally described as 211 Greenfield Way, Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta (the “Property”).
2. The Clerk called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and provided a brief overview of the hearing process.
3. At the start of the Hearing, a motion was made by Wayne Sims to appoint Birgit Blizzard as Chair. The motion was passed unanimously.
4. A motion was then made by Barb Aitken to adopt the Agenda, as presented. The motion was passed unanimously.
5. The Chair outlined how the hearing would be conducted to all parties present. There were no objections to the proposed Hearing process.
6. The Chair requested confirmation from all parties in attendance that there was no opposition to the composition of the Board hearing the Appeal. None of the persons in attendance had any objection to the members of the Board hearing the Appeal.
7. Based on the information provided by the Development Authority, the Appeal appears to have been filed on time, in accordance with Section 686(1) of the MGA.
8. The Clerk confirmed there were no other submissions to the Agenda package at the commencement of the hearing.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENT:

9. The following is a summary of the oral evidence presented to the Board.

Development Authority Presentation:

10. The Board first heard from the Development Authority of the City, referencing the materials submitted, attached to the Agenda as Exhibit "B".
11. The Development Authority provided an overview of the events leading up to the Appeal, being: The Appellant is appealing the decision of the Development Authority to refuse a Development Permit Application for a detached garage with a garage suite.
12. The Property is districted as RE- Residential Estate Lot District. Within this land use district, Land Use Bylaw C23-20 requires no more than one access per residential site, as per Section 6.1. Sections 6.2.5(a) and 6.14.4(a) further require a detached garage on a corner site to comply with the minimum front flanking yard setback of 6.5 m. Section 6.14.4(d) establishes a maximum building height of 7.3 m and a maximum wall height of 3.7 m for accessory buildings on sites under 0.8 ha.
13. The proposed detached garage with garage suite complies with the requirements of Section 5.28 of the Land Use Bylaw, which regulates garage suites. The proposed development does not comply with Sections 6.1, 6.2.5(a) and 6.14.4. The proposed development includes second access to the Property, front flanking yard setbacks of approximately 2.032 m and 2.136 m, a building height of approximately 7.34 m, and a wall height of approximately 3.88 m.
14. On July 7, 2026, a Development Permit Application for a detached garage with a garage suite was submitted to the Planning and Development Department.
15. On August 18, 2026, the Development Authority refused the Development Permit Application at the request of the applicant.
16. The Development Authority advised that it was prepared to support variances to the maximum building height and wall height and to permit a second access to the Property. The Development Authority was of the opinion that these variances would not negatively impact adjacent properties and noted that the proposed second access was supported by the Public Works and Engineering departments.
17. With respect to the front flanking yard setback, the Development Authority advised that the proposed setbacks of approximately 2.032 m and 2.136 m represented a variance of approximately 69% from the required 6.5 m setback. The Development Authority was prepared to support a variance to 5.0 m, representing approximately 23% from the minimum requirement, to accommodate on-site parking adjacent to the proposed garage suite. The Development Authority was not prepared to approve the front flanking yard setbacks as proposed in the Development Permit Application.

18. The Development Authority advised that the applicant requested that the Development Permit Application be refused as submitted rather than revise the proposed development to address the front flanking yard setback.
19. The Development Authority subsequently refused the Development Permit Application, following which the applicant filed the Appeal.
20. The Development Authority advised that it had prepared options for the Board's consideration, which could be addressed during questions from the Board.

Questions of the Board to the Development Authority:

21. *Why was the Development Authority prepared to support a 5.0 m front flanking yard setback?*

The Development Authority advised that a 5.0 m setback was considered reasonable as it would provide sufficient space on the Property to accommodate on-site parking without encroaching into the road right-of-way.

22. *If the Appeal is not approved by the Board, would the Development Authority remain supportive of a 5.0 m front flanking yard setback?*

The Development Authority confirmed that it was supportive of a variance to a 5.0 m setback, as outlined in its report. However, the Development Authority advised that, following the refusal of a Development Permit, the Land Use Bylaw requires any new application submitted within six months to comply with the Land Use Bylaw in its entirety, including the required setback.

23. *To the Development Authority's knowledge, are there any other garage suites in the area?*

The Development Authority advised that it did not know whether there were other garage suites in the area.

24. *Is the Development Authority aware of any other accessory buildings that are approximately 1,700 square feet and 22 feet in height?*

The Development Authority advised that it believed there were other accessory buildings of a similar size and height but could not identify their locations.

25. *Was the front flanking yard setback the only remaining concern of the Development Authority before the applicant requested that the Development Permit Application be refused?*

The Development Authority confirmed that it was.

26. *What is the intent of the 6.5 m front flanking yard setback requirement within the RE – Residential Estate Lot District?*

The Development Authority advised that the setback requirement was believed to relate primarily to the larger size of lots within the RE – Residential Estate Lot District, which have greater setbacks than other residential districts. The Development Authority further advised that visual considerations may also have been a factor in establishing the 6.5 m setback.

27. *Is there a maximum percentage variance that the Development Authority may grant?*

The Development Authority advised that there is no prescribed maximum percentage variance. A variance of up to 100% could be granted where supported by the planning merits of the application, taking into consideration the circumstances and context of the site. In this case, the Development Authority was prepared to support the requested height variances but did not consider there to be sufficient justification to support the proposed front flanking yard setback variance of approximately 70%.

Appellant Presentation:

28. The Appellant referenced the materials provided in support of the Appeal, attached as Exhibit “C”, which included the Notice of Appeal, written submission, photographs and supporting materials illustrating the proposed location of the detached garage with garage suite and letters of support from four neighbouring property owners. The Appellant further advised that verbal support had been received from a fifth neighbouring property owner. The written submission requested variances to the front flanking yard setback, maximum wall height and maximum building height.
29. The Appellant advised that the primary concern with the proposed development appeared to be the front flanking yard setback. The Appellant stated that the detached garage with garage suite had been designed with an approximately 2.0 m setback and that the required 6.5 m setback created a significant constraint on the proposed location of the development.
30. The Appellant stated that the Property is constrained by an existing 6.0 m utility right-of-way along the rear of the Property and that applying the required 6.5 m front flanking yard setback would move the detached garage with garage suite toward the centre of the rear yard and directly behind the sunroom of the principal dwelling. The Appellant stated that the proposed setback of approximately 2.0 m would preserve sightlines from the principal dwelling and provide more usable space within the rear yard. This was illustrated through photographs and other visual materials included in the Appellant’s submission.
31. The Appellant advised that a substantial boulevard and ditch are located between the Property and the roadway and that, with the proposed setback, there would remain more than 26 feet of separation between the detached garage with garage suite and the travelled portion of the roadway. The Appellant stated that the proposed location would not impact traffic or sightlines.
32. The Appellant advised that the additional access to the Property was primarily intended to allow a trailer to be stored within the detached garage rather than on the existing front

driveway and that sufficient parking is available on the existing driveway. The Appellant stated that the requirement limiting a residential site to one access was not known when the development was originally designed.

33. The Appellant advised that the garage suite is intended to provide future residential accommodation for family members, including younger family members as they transition to independent living or aging parents. The Appellant stated that the proposed development was designed to complement the principal dwelling and fit within the surrounding neighbourhood.
34. The Appellant stated that neighbouring property owners were contacted regarding the proposed development and that those who were contacted had not expressed concerns with its proposed location. The Appellant also referenced examples included in the submission of other corner properties in the neighbourhood with accessory buildings located approximately 2.0 m to 3.5 m from the roadway and stated that the proposed development was consistent with the established development pattern in the neighbourhood.

Questions of the Board to the Appellant:

35. *You indicated that you were unable to contact one neighbouring property owner. Did you attempt to contact that property owner?*

The Appellant advised that they attempted to contact the neighbouring property owner on a couple of evenings, but the property owner was not home.

36. *Are you related to any of the neighbouring property owners who provided support for the proposed development?*

The Appellant advised that they are not related to any of the neighbouring property owners who provided support.

37. *Other than being neighbours, do you have any other relationship with the neighbouring property owners who provided support?*

The Appellant advised that some of the neighbouring property owners were acquaintances from living in Fort Saskatchewan but that there was no other relationship. The Appellant further advised that the principal dwelling on the Property is currently under construction and they do not yet reside at the Property, so there has been limited opportunity to become acquainted with the surrounding property owners.

38. *The Appellant's submission includes examples of other properties that the Appellant identified as having accessory buildings located less than 6.5 m from the property line. Are there any additional details regarding these properties or other similar properties in the neighbourhood?*

The Appellant advised that the examples included two properties near Dillingham Avenue and Greenfield Way and one property near Dillingham Avenue and Greenfield Bend. Based on measurements using Google mapping, the Appellant

estimated that the accessory buildings were approximately 2.0 m to 3.5 m from the property line. The Appellant clarified that the actual property lines were not known and that the estimates assumed the existing fences represented the property lines.

39. *Would the Appellant be prepared to reduce the length of the proposed detached garage to provide a greater setback?*

The Appellant advised that they would not, as reducing the length of the proposed detached garage would not allow the Appellant's travel trailer to fit within the garage.

40. *Where would occupants of the garage suite park?*

The Appellant advised that parking could be accommodated in front of the proposed garage suite. The Appellant stated that, due to the boulevard and ditch, there would be approximately 20 feet between the roadway and the property line available as part of the driveway area.

41. *Do you currently have a fence on the Property, and are you planning to construct one?*

The Appellant advised that there is currently no fence and that a fence would eventually be constructed on the Property.

42. *Do you currently own a travel trailer that you intend to store in the proposed detached garage?*

The Appellant confirmed that they currently own a travel trailer.

Those Speaking in Favour of the Appeal:

43. There were no Parties that presented in favor of the Appeal.

Those Speaking in Opposition to the Appeal:

44. There were no Parties that presented in opposition to the Appeal.

Additional Questions of the Board:

45. *Question to the Development Authority: If the proposed garage suite has an approximately 2.0 m setback from the property line, would a vehicle parked in front of the garage suite extend beyond the Property onto the public portion of the driveway?*

The Development Authority confirmed that a vehicle longer than the available space between the garage suite and the property line would extend onto the public portion of the driveway.

46. *Question to the Development Authority: Is there a requirement that an occupant of the garage suite park on the driveway associated with the garage suite, or could they park on the existing driveway for the principal dwelling?*

The Development Authority confirmed that there is no requirement for the occupant of the garage suite to park in front of the garage suite and that they could park on the existing driveway serving the principal dwelling.

47. *Question to the Development Authority: Would the existing driveway serving the principal dwelling satisfy the on-site parking requirement for the garage suite?*

The Development Authority confirmed that the required on-site parking could be provided on the existing driveway serving the principal dwelling.

48. *Question to the Development Authority: How many on-site parking spaces are required for the principal dwelling and garage suite?*

The Development Authority advised that two parking spaces are required for the principal dwelling, and one additional parking space is required for the garage suite.

49. *Question to the Development Authority: Were the other properties identified by the Appellant with accessory buildings located closer to the roadway the subject of previous SDAB decisions or approved variances?*

The Development Authority advised that the identified properties had not been investigated because previous approvals would not establish a precedent for the Appeal. As a result, the Development Authority could not confirm whether the developments had received variances or had been approved under SDAB decisions.

50. *Question to the Development Authority: Has the Land Use Bylaw changed with respect to the requirements applicable to these properties?*

The Development Authority advised that the Land Use Bylaw requirements for the RE – Residential Estate Lot District had changed to limit residential sites to one access, whereas two accesses had previously been permitted. The Development Authority stated that it was possible the properties identified by the Appellant were developed when two accesses were permitted but could not confirm this. The Development Authority believed that the 6.5 m front flanking yard setback requirement had remained in place.

51. *Question to the Development Authority: Could the properties identified by the Appellant have previously been granted variances to the front flanking yard setback?*

The Development Authority confirmed that this was possible but could not confirm whether variances had been granted for those properties.

52. *Question to the Development Authority: What options are available to the Board if it overturns the Development Authority's decision?*

The Development Authority advised that the Board could:

- a. approve the detached garage with garage suite in compliance with all applicable regulations of Land Use Bylaw C23-20, with a variance to Section 6.1.1 to permit a second access to the Property; or
- b. approve the detached garage with garage suite with variances, at the Board's discretion, to Sections 6.1.1, 6.2.5(a)(i), 6.14.4(a) and 6.14.4(d).

The Development Authority further advised that the Board was not limited to these options and could determine which variances, if any, to grant and the extent of those variances. This could include requiring the detached garage with garage suite to comply with all applicable regulations of the Land Use Bylaw, including the requirement for one access to the Property.

Where a second access is permitted, the Development Authority recommended conditions requiring the applicant / owner to provide security prior to commencing work or by a date established by the Board, whichever occurs earlier, and requiring the culvert to be constructed in accordance with City engineering standards. The Development Authority advised that it typically allows approximately 60 days for the security to be provided but that the date would be at the Board's discretion. The security would ensure completion of the conditions of the Development Permit and could be called upon by the City if the conditions are not complied with or the authorized work is not completed.

53. *Question to the Development Authority: Are the options presented the only options available to the Board?*

The Development Authority advised that there are a number of options available to the Board and confirmed that the Board has the authority to determine which variances, if any, to grant and the extent of those variances.

54. *Question to the Development Authority: Does option 2 specify a particular front flanking yard setback?*

The Development Authority advised that Option 2 does not specify a particular setback and that the Board could determine the extent of the front flanking yard setback variance.

55. *Question to the Development Authority: Did the Development Authority have concerns regarding the on-site or off-site parking associated with the proposed garage suite?*

The Development Authority advised that the proposed development meets the on-site parking requirements. However, the Development Authority stated that, in its opinion, an occupant of the garage suite would likely park in front of the garage suite rather than on the driveway serving the principal dwelling.

56. *Question to the Development Authority: What concerns would arise from using the public portion of the driveway between the property line and roadway for parking?*

The Development Authority advised that it did not identify any harm with that portion of the driveway being used for parking and noted that residential driveways extend through the public road right-of-way to the roadway and that parking within this area does occur. The Development Authority advised that its concern was not the use of the driveway for parking, but rather the magnitude of the requested variance from the 6.5 m front flanking yard setback. The Development Authority acknowledged the 6.0 m utility right-of-way along the rear of the Property and the Appellant's concern that complying with the setback would affect sightlines from the principal dwelling but noted that the detached garage on the neighbouring property to the rear complied with the Land Use Bylaw.

57. *Question to the Development Authority: Does the 6.0 m utility right-of-way along the rear of the Property require an additional 6.0 m setback?*

The Development Authority advised that the 6.0 m utility right-of-way is located along the rear boundary of the Property. Buildings are not permitted to encroach into the utility right-of-way but may be located immediately adjacent to its boundary. The Development Authority further advised that, if the utility right-of-way did not exist, the detached garage could be located approximately 2.0 m from the rear boundary of the Property.

58. *Question to the Development Authority: Are there any sewer or other servicing capacity concerns associated with the additional occupants of the proposed garage suite?*

The Development Authority advised that there were no servicing capacity concerns associated with the garage suite. The Development Authority further advised that Public Works and Engineering supported the proposed second access and that a culvert would be required to ensure the second access does not adversely affect stormwater drainage.

59. *Question to the Appellant: Does the proposed detached garage contain two bays, and what is the intended use of the second bay?*

The Appellant confirmed that the proposed detached garage contains two bays. One bay is intended to accommodate the travel trailer, while the other could be used for vehicle parking or as a workshop. The Appellant noted that an older restored Jeep may be stored in the second bay.

60. *Question to the Appellant: Is any commercial activity intended to operate from the proposed detached garage?*

The Appellant confirmed that no commercial activity is intended.

61. *Question to the Secretary: Have any additional documents or correspondence been received, including whether in favour of or in opposition to the Appeal, that were not included in the Agenda package?*

The Secretary confirmed that no additional documents or correspondence had been received.

62. The Chair declared a recess at 1:44 p.m.; the Hearing reconvened at 2:00 p.m.

Closing Comments of the Development Authority:

63. The Development Authority recommended that the Board overturn the refusal and approve the development permit with variances. The Development Authority confirmed its support for the proposed building and wall height variances and the second access to the Property. With respect to the front flanking yard setback, the Development Authority recommended that the Board determine the extent of the variance at its discretion, noting that if the Board was not comfortable with the proposed approximately 2.0 m setback, it could consider a different setback.

Closing Comments from the Appellant:

64. In their closing remarks, the Appellant asked the Board to overturn the Development Authority's decision and approve the development as proposed, including any required variances. The Appellant reiterated their opinion that the detached garage with garage suite, as designed and located, would not negatively impact the City or neighbouring properties. The Appellant stated that requiring a different setback would impact their family by reducing sightlines and usable rear yard space and require redesign of the development, resulting in additional costs and building delays.

At the close of the hearing the parties acknowledged that they felt they had been provided with an adequate opportunity to state their case and felt that the hearing process was conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

The hearing adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

DECISION:

65. It is the decision of the Board that the Appeal be GRANTED, and the Development Permit PLRES20260592 be ISSUED.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

66. The Board makes the findings of fact set out below:
67. The Property is located at Lot 26, Block 05, Plan 062 9672, and municipally described as 211 Greenfield Way, Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta.
68. The Property is zoned as RE- Residential Estate Lot District.
69. The Development Application PLRES20260592 for a detached garage with garage suite was refused.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

70. The Board's jurisdiction is found in section 687(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*. In making this decision, the Board has examined the provisions of the Land Use Bylaw, all applicable statutory plans, and has considered the oral and written submissions made by the Development Authority and the Appellant.
71. ***Affected Persons:***
Pursuant to Sections 687(1)(c), and 687(1)(d) of the MGA the Board must hear from those given notice and under section 687(1)(d), from those claiming to be affected. The Appellant's submission, attached as Exhibit "C", included letters of support from four (4) adjacent property owners who were provided the Notice of Appeal. No additional submissions were received from affected persons, and no affected persons appeared before the Board in support of or in opposition to the Appeal.
72. **ALSA Regional Plan**
There is no ALSA regional plan applicable to the Property. Therefore, the Board need not consider this plan.
73. **Statutory Plans**
The Board was not provided with evidence from the Development Authority about the City's statutory plans. There was no comment from the parties about the statutory plans and in the absence of any evidence that the matter before it was contradictory to the statutory plans, the Board finds there is compliance with the statutory plans.
74. **Subdivision and Development Regulations**
The Board must have regard for the Subdivision and Development Regulations in making its decision. Neither the Development Authority nor the Appellant raised the Subdivision and Development Regulations. The Board found no conflict between the Subdivision and Development Regulations and the subject of this permit.
75. **Land Use Bylaw**
The Board considered the Development Permit Appeal and the evidence presented by all parties in the course of the hearing, weighing it against the provisions of Sections 3.3.1, 5.28, 6.1, 6.2.5(a)(i), 6.14.4(a) and 6.14.4(d) of the Land Use Bylaw. The Board determined that the proposed development would not:
- i) Unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighborhood; or
 - ii) Materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment, and safety or value of neighboring land, based on the following factors:
 - (1) The Board considered the size and characteristics of the Property and its location within the RE – Residential Estate Lot District. The Board noted that properties within this district are larger residential estate lots and found that the size of the Property provided sufficient area to accommodate the proposed detached garage with garage suite, including the second access, the 2.0 m front flanking yard setback, and the proposed building and wall heights of 7.34 m and 3.88 m, respectively.

- (2) The Board considered the design and appearance of the proposed detached garage with garage suite and found that the development was designed to complement the principal dwelling and was consistent with the residential character of the Property and surrounding neighbourhood. In considering the requested height variances, the Board also considered the Development Authority's support for the variances and its opinion that they would not negatively impact adjacent properties. The Board considered the proposed building height of 7.34 m, which exceeds the 7.3 m maximum by 0.04 m, and the proposed wall height of 3.88 m, which exceeds the 3.7 m maximum by 0.18 m. The Board found that the proposed building height of 7.34 m and wall height of 3.88 m would not negatively affect the appearance or character of the neighbourhood or neighbouring properties and considered the requested height variances to be minimal.
- (3) The Board considered the letters of support from four (4) adjacent property owners included with the Appellant's submission. Each of these property owners was provided the Notice of Appeal, and no additional submissions were received from affected persons. No affected persons appeared before the Board in opposition to the Appeal. The Board considered the absence of concerns from adjacent property owners, together with the letters of support, in determining that the proposed development would not materially interfere with or affect the use or enjoyment of neighbouring land.
- (4) The Board considered the proposed second access to the Property, requiring a variance to Section 6.1.1, and the proposed front flanking yard setback of 2.0 m, rather than the 6.5 m required under Sections 6.2.5(a)(i) and 6.14.4(a), and found that the proposed development would not create a safety concern or negatively affect sightlines along the adjacent roadway or neighbouring properties. The Board also considered that the second access had been reviewed and supported by the Development Authority in consultation with the Public Works and Engineering departments. The Development Authority recommended that approval of the second access be subject to conditions requiring the applicant to provide security by the date established in the Development Permit and requiring the culvert to be constructed in accordance with the City's engineering standards. The Board agreed that these conditions were appropriate and imposed them as conditions of the Development Permit.
- (5) The Board found that the proposed development would provide more on-site parking than required by the Land Use Bylaw. The Board also considered the evidence that parking for the garage suite could be accommodated on the existing driveway for the principal dwelling and found that granting the variance to permit a 2.0 m front flanking yard setback would not result in a negative parking impact on neighbouring properties or the surrounding area.
- (6) With respect to the amenities of the neighbourhood, the Board considered the physical characteristics of the area adjacent to the proposed development,

including the boulevard and ditch between the Property and the roadway. The Board also noted that there is no sidewalk along this portion of the Property that would be affected by the proposed development. Based on the evidence before it, the Board determined that the 2.0 m front flanking yard setback, rather than the 6.5 m required by the Land Use Bylaw, would not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood.

- (7) The Board considered the effect of the required 6.5 m front flanking yard setback and the 6.0 m utility right-of-way along the rear of the Property on the location of the proposed detached garage with garage suite. The Board considered the Appellant's evidence that requiring a greater front flanking yard setback would move the development further into the centre of the rear yard, reducing sightlines and usable rear yard space and requiring redesign of the development. In the absence of evidence demonstrating a corresponding negative impact on neighbouring properties or the surrounding area from the proposed location, the Board determined that the requested 2.0 m front flanking yard setback variance was reasonable in the circumstances of the Property.

MERITS OF THE APPEAL:

76. For the above reasons, the Appeal is GRANTED and the Development Permit for the detached garage with garage suite is ISSUED with the following variances and conditions:

Variances:

- a. Section 6.1.1 – to permit a second access to the Property;
- b. Sections 6.2.5(a)(i) and 6.14.4(a) – to permit a front flanking yard setback of 2.0 m, rather than the required 6.5 m; and
- c. Section 6.14.4(d) – to permit a maximum building height of 7.34 m, rather than 7.3 m, and a maximum wall height of 3.88 m, rather than 3.7 m.

Conditions:

- d. The applicant / owner shall provide \$5,000.00 security, in the form of cash, certified cheque, or an irrevocable letter of credit acceptable to the City, prior to commencing work or by November 30, 2026, whichever occurs earlier. The security shall ensure completion of all Development Permit conditions.
- e. The City may call upon the security, in whole or in part, if the applicant / owner fails to comply with any condition of the Development Permit, the Development Permit is suspended or cancelled, authorized work has not commenced, or commenced work has not been completed within a reasonable period as determined by the City.
- f. The culvert shall be constructed in accordance with the City of Fort Saskatchewan Engineering Standards.

Dated at the City of Fort Saskatchewan in the Province of Alberta, this 1st day of October, 2026.

Clerk: Rachelle Gilbert
Signed on behalf of Board Chair,
Rachelle Gilbert, Clerk, Subdivision and
Development Appeal Board.

The decision of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board is final and binding on all parties, subject only to Appeal to the Court of Appeal under Section 688 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26