

Table 1: Approved Permits appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Permit Type	Total Number of Approved Permits Analyzed with Decisions Appealed to the Board	Number of Approvals Upheld by the Board	Number of Approvals Overturned by the Board	Number of Approvals where the Board had No Jurisdiction*
Single Detached Housing	12	6 (50%)	2 (17%)	4 (33%)
Garage and Garden Suites	9	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)
Semi-detached Housing	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Multi-family Residential Projects	9	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
House Additions	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Accessory Buildings	5	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
Uncovered Deck	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Residential Sales Centre	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Major Commercial and Industrial Projects	23	15 (65%)	0 (0%)	8** (35%)
Total	65	39 (60%)	6 (9%)	20 (31%)

*Common reasons for the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board to have no jurisdiction in an appeal decision include: late filing of appeal by the appellant and the appellant withdrawing an appeal.

**There is one permit awaiting hearing at the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board at time of report analysis.
Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 2: Refused Permits appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Permit Type	Total Number of Refused Permits Analyzed with Decisions Appealed to the Board	Number of Refusals Upheld by the Board	Number of Refusals Overturned by the Board	Number of Refusals where the Board had No Jurisdiction*
Single Detached Housing	8	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	0 (0%)
Garage and Garden Suites	10	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Semi-detached Housing	19	5 (26%)	12 (63%)	2 (11%)
Multi-family Residential Projects	6	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)
House Additions	10	1 (10%)	8 (80%)	1 (10%)
Accessory Buildings	13	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)
Uncovered Deck	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Residential Sales Centre	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Major Commercial and Industrial Projects	37	17 (46%)	13 (35%)	7 (19%)
Total	105	30 (29%)	63 (60%)	12 (11%)

*Common reasons for the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board to have no jurisdiction in an appeal decision include: late filing of appeal by the appellant and the appellant withdrawing an appeal.

Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Single Detached Housing

Twelve approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Six of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits include variances to: dormer width length, reduced Rear Setback, reduced Side Setback and driveway location.
- Two of the appealed approvals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These two approvals contained variances for a reduced Rear Setback and front driveways and were subsequently approved by the Board.
- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for four of the appealed approvals.

Eight refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed refusal decision was upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. This permit was refused on the basis of the reduced distance from the yard to the nearby proposed park site.
- Seven of the appealed refusal decisions were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits were refused on the basis of exceeding maximum height, site coverage and cantilever length. These permits were subsequently approved by the Board.

Garage and Garden Suites

Nine approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Two of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. Some variances contained in these permits include variances to: increased Site Coverage, reduced parking spaces and reduced Separation Space between the Garage and house.
- One appealed approval was overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. This approval did not contain any variances, however, it was a Class B development as Garage and Garden Suites are listed as a discretionary use in the RF1 Single Detached Residential zone.
- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for six appealed approvals.

Ten refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- 10 of the appealed refusal decisions were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits were refused on the basis of exceeding maximum height, garage location, increased Site Coverage and increased Floor Area. These permits were subsequently approved by the Board.

Semi-detached Housing

Four approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Four of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeals Board. Variances contained in these permits include: reduced Site width and reduced Site Area.

Nineteen refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Five of the appealed refusals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. Some variances for these permits include: increased Site Coverage, reduced Site width, reduced Private Outdoor Amenity Area and reduced Front Setback.
- 12 of the appealed refusals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. Some variances for these permits include: a reduced Front Setback, reduced Rear Setback, reduced Site Width, exceeding permitted Site Coverage.
- In two appeals, the Subdivision and Development Appeals Board had no jurisdiction.

Multi-family Residential Projects

Nine approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Eight of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. Some variances contained in these permits include: landscaping, reduction of parking spaces and increased Site Area.
- One appealed approval was overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently refused. This permit contained variances to: reductions in Site Area, Site Width, Side Setback, number of parking spaces, and Separation Space.

Six refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Two of the appealed refusals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. Some variances contained in these permits include variances to: reduced Site Area, locational criteria, Private Outdoor Amenity.
- Four of the appealed refusals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. Some variances in this permit include: increased density, reduced Amenity Area, Site Area and Site Width.

House Additions

One approval decision appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed approval was upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. The permit included a variance to Site Area.

Ten refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed refusal was upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits were refused on the basis of: reduced Side and Rear Setbacks and exceeding requirements for eaves projections into the Side Setback.
- Eight of the appealed refusals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. Some variances for these permits include: increased Site Coverage, reduction of Private Outdoor Amenity Area, reduced Front Setback and reduced Rear Setback.
- The Subdivision and Development Appeals Board had no jurisdiction for one appealed refusal.

Accessory Buildings

Five approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Two of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits were refused on the basis of: Exceeding height and Site Coverage requirements and a reduced Side Setback.
- One appealed approval was overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently refused. This permit

contained variances for: a reduced Side Setback, and increased eaves projection into the Side Setback.

- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for two of the appealed approvals.

Thirteen refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- Four of the appealed refusals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits were refused on the basis of: increased Site Coverage, Accessory building location on the lot, reduced Side Setback, and an Accessory building not being a listed Use within the zone.
- Eight of the appealed refusals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. These permits contained variances for: reduced Side Setback, Separation Space between another structure, and increased Site Coverage.
- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for one appealed refusal.

Uncovered Deck

One approval decision appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed approval was overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently refused. This permit contained a variance for increased projection into the Rear Setback.

One refusal decision appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for one appealed refusal.

Residential Sales Centre

One approval decision appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed approval was upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. This permit did not contain a variance, however, a Residential Sales Centre is a Discretionary use within the RSL Small Lot Residential zone.

One refusal decision appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- One appealed refusal was overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. This permit contained variances for: exceeding permitted Height and a reduced Side Setback.

Major Commercial and Industrial Projects

Twenty-three approval decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- 15 of the appealed approvals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits contained variances related to parking. Some variances include: a reduction in the required number of parking spaces and a reduction to the number of loading spaces.
- The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction for seven appealed approvals.
- One appeal was pending hearing at time of writing.

Thirty-seven refusal decisions appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

- 17 of the appealed refusals were upheld by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. These permits contained variances related to parking. Some variances include: a reduction in the required number of parking spaces, deficiencies in parking lot design standards, and a reduction to the number of loading spaces.
- 13 of the appealed refusals were overturned by the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board and subsequently approved. Some variances contained in these permits include: reduced number of parking spaces, increased occupancy limits and reduced number of loading spaces.
- In seven appeals, the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board had no jurisdiction.