SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK

AGENDA

Tuesday October 27, 2026 – at Wildwillow Enterprises Inc. Main Office (2317 Township Road 545, Lac Ste. Anne County, Alberta, T0E 1V0, East End Fire Hall of LSAC) – 1:00 p.m.

---

1. Call to Order:

   a) Land Acknowledgement:

   The Summer Village of Nakamun Park acknowledges that we are meeting on Treaty 6 Territory and on the homelands of the Metis Nation. We acknowledge all indigenous peoples who have walked these land for centuries, and where wrongs have been done, we dedicate our efforts to moving forward in a renewed spirit of reconciliation and collaboration with our indigenous stakeholders, friends, and neighbours so that the mistakes of the past are never repeated in the future.

2. Agenda:

   a) Tuesday October 27th, 2026 Regular Meeting Agenda

Page 1-7

   (approve as presented or amended)

3. Minutes:

   a) Tuesday September 22nd, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

Page 8-12

Subsequent to an inquiry from the public, Administration is suggesting that the Tuesday, September 22nd 2026 Draft Regular Meeting minutes may have incorrect wording for motion 147-26. It currently reads as follows:

MOVED by Deputy Mayor Charter that Council accepts the Development Officers report as presented, AND THAT the following properties require further action:

- 5098 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development
- 5099 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development
- 5100 4 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address shed, logs, and overgrown state of Lands.
- 5052 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed that has been moved in and rehash issue with two RVs.
- 5054 5 St - **In light of a new Court ruling**, DO recommend no action on fencing until matter addresses in **MDP**.
- 5065 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed and the RV.
- 5066 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the two sheds; ignore fence at this time.
- 5001 Hillcrest - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands.

- 5032 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the three sheds and a deck.
- 5033 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the RV, deck, and play structure.
- 5634 6 St - DO to issue ENFORCEMENT Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands.

CARRIED

We are seeking a motion to amend the minutes to the following:

MOVED by _____ that Council accepts the Development Officers report as presented, AND THAT the following properties require further action:

- 5098 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development
- 5099 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development
- 5100 4 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address shed, logs, and overgrown state of Lands.
- 5052 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed that has been moved in and rehash issue with two RVs.
- 5054 5 St – **Awaiting Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB) ruling**, DO recommend no action on fencing until matter addressed in **SDAB**.
- 5065 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed and the RV.
- 5066 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the two sheds; ignore fence at this time.
- 5001 Hillcrest - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands.
- 5032 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the three sheds and a deck.
- 5033 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the RV, deck, and play structure.
- 5634 6 St - DO to issue ENFORCEMENT Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands.

(approve the September 22, 2026 Regular Council Meeting Minutes be amended..)

4. Appointment:

a) 2:00 p.m. – Tony Sonnleitner, Development Officer – DO Report

b) 2:30 p.m. – Mark Miller, OMNP Services, IT, and Heather Luhtala, Finance Officer – email breach. This discussion will take place in Closed Session.

5. Bylaws/Policies:

a) **Bylaw 2026-7 – Municipal Borrowing Bylaw**

Page 13-15

This is the municipality's borrowing bylaw which ATB Financial has requested be approved annually, this bylaw is for the 2027 Operating Year. The borrowing bylaw is in place for interim funding in the event of a local emergency or to cover unforeseen urgent operating expenditures not included in the operating budget, principal sum of $150,000.00. Administration is requesting all readings to this bylaw.

(that bylaw 2026-7, being a Municipal Borrowing Bylaw for the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, be given first reading as presented.)

(that Bylaw 2026-7, be given second reading as presented)

(that unanimous consent be given to proceed to third reading of Bylaw 2026-7, in one sitting.)

(that Bylaw 2026-7, Municipal Borrowing Bylaw, be given third and final reading as presented)

Or

(defer for further changes)

b) **Bylaw 2026-8 – Credit Card Borrowing Bylaw**

Page 16-17

The municipality may make a credit card borrowing bylaw for the purpose of financing operating expenditures of the municipality, provided that the amount to be borrowed, together with the unpaid principal of other borrowings made for the purpose of financing operating expenditures, must not exceed the amount the municipality estimates will be raised in taxes in the year the borrowing is made. This bylaw is renewed every 3 years and the maximum borrowing amount is $5,000.00.

(that bylaw 2026-8, being a Credit Card Borrowing Bylaw for the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, be given first reading as presented.)

(that Bylaw 2026-8, be given second reading as presented)

(that unanimous consent be given to proceed to third reading of Bylaw 2026-8, in one sitting.)

(that Bylaw 2026-8, Credit Card Borrowing Bylaw, be given third and final reading as presented)

Or

(defer for further changes)

c) **A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy**
Further to September 22, 2026 council meeting, attached is the draft A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy with the changes as discussed at meeting time.

Page 18-22

(that A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy be approved as is or with amendments)

Or

(direction as given by Council at meeting time)

d) **Bylaw 2026-9 – Fees and Charges Bylaw**
Due to the changes to A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy, attached is a draft of the updated Fees and Charges Bylaw to reflect these changes. We also deleted the waste token fee as this system is no longer in use.

Page 23-31

(that bylaw 2026-9, being a Fees and Charges Bylaw for the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, be given first reading as presented/amended.)

(that Bylaw 2026-9, be given second reading as presented/amended)

(that unanimous consent be given to proceed to third reading of Bylaw 2026-9, in one sitting.)

(that Bylaw 2026-9, Fees and Charges Bylaw, be given third and final reading as presented/amended)

Or

(direction as given by Council at meeting time)

6. Business:

a) **October 27, 2026 Regular Council Meeting start time**
As per the request by CAO Wildman and the subsequent approval of Council, the start time for the October 27, 2026 Regular Council meeting was changed from 2:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

(ratify the October 27, 2026 Regular Council Meeting start time from 2:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

b) **2027 Draft Capital Budget**
Administration is preparing the 2027 Draft Operating and Capital Budgets and is asking what Council's priorities would be. We understand one addition will be the Pickleball Courts. Attached is a grant availability report and a background report with respect to previous discussions on the pickleball courts project.

Page 32-35

(direction as given by Council at meeting time)

c) **Location of Waste Bins within Summer Village of Nakamun Park**
As requested by Council, due to a request made by a potential vendor of a property within the summer village, the matter of the current location of the waste bins has been brought to the agenda for discussion.

(to accept the discussion on the current location of the waste bins within the Summer Village of Nakamun Park as information AND _____)

Or

(some other direction as given by Council at meeting time)

d) **Designate a new Assessor Officer**
We received an email from our Assessment Service Provider asking that we designate a new assessment officer, Vanessa Vaughan. As they needed a response before the date of the meeting, we asked for a response via email and now ask that it be ratified.

Page 36

(to ratify that Council confirm the engagement of Municipal Assessment Services Group and the appointment of Vanessa Vaughan as municipal assessor, a designated officer position for the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, effective October 23, 2026.)

e)

f)

g)

7. Financial

a) Payables listing as of September 30, 2026

b) Income/Expense Statement for Period Ending September 30, 2026

Page 37-53

c) Bank Reconciliation as of September 30, 2026

(all items to be circulated for review during the meeting)

(approve financial items a-c as presented for information)

8. Councillor Reports

a) Mayor
   i. Committee Updates
   ii. Other

b) Deputy Mayor
   i. Committee Updates
   ii. Other

c) Councillor
   i. Committee Updates
   ii. Other

(approve as presented for information)

9. Administration Reports

a) Chief Administrative Officer (CAO):
   i. DDEM
   ii. Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB) Notice of Decision for Appeal of the refusal for the variance to 26DP01-23 (5607 Nakamun)
   iii. CAO/Administration Contract

Page 54-65

b) Development Officer (DO) as per 2:30 p.m. appointment
   i. Enforcement Report

(approve as presented for information)

SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK

AGENDA

Tuesday October 27, 2026 – at Wildwillow Enterprises Inc. Main Office (2317 Township Road 545, Lac Ste. Anne County, Alberta, T0E 1V0, East End Fire Hall of LSAC) – 1:00 p.m.

---

10. Information and Correspondence

Page 66-80 a) Yellowhead Regional Library (YRL) – September 28, 2026 – Draft 2027 Budget

Page 81 b) Fire Rescue International, Invoice 1434 – October 2, 2026 – no charge invoice for Medical First Response (no charge value of $1,068.75)

Page 82 c) Government of Alberta, Victoria Bachmann, Assistant Deputy Minister, Municipal Assessment and Grants – October 6, 2026 – Local Government Fiscal Framework (LGFF) and Community Stream Spending Timelines

Page 83-84 d) Alberta Municipalities (ABMunis) – October 7, 2026 – Update on Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) Collective Bargaining

Page 85-86 e) Government of Alberta, Lynn Varty, Assistant Deputy Minister, Traffic Safety Services – October 16, 2026 – Changes to the Administration of Automated Traffic Enforcement (ATE) program.

(approve as presented for information)

11. Closed Meeting

under separate cover a) Mark Miller, OMNP Services, IT, Heather Luhtala, Finance Officer Email Breach – Access to Information Act (ATIA) Section 19(1)

12. Next Meeting Date

a) The next regular council meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 27, 2026, at 2:00 p.m.

13. Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings:

October 23, 2026 – Regional Municipalities Meeting
October 27, 2026 – Regular Council meeting
November 7, 2026 – SVLSACE meeting
November 19, 2026 - Regular Council Meeting
December 9, 2026 – SVREMP Agency/Advisory Meeting

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL OF THE SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK, IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, HELD ON TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 22, 2026 AT 2:00 P.M. AT THE WILDWILLOW ENTERPRISES INC.MAIN OFFICE.

	PRESENT	Mayor: Keith Pederson Deputy Mayor: Robert Charter Councillor: Raymond Gertz Administration: Wendy Wildman, Chief Administrative Officer (via Zoom) Sandra Schneider, Administrative Assistant Attendee(s): N/A Appointments: N/A Absent: N/A Public Works: N/A Public at Large: 0 in person, 0 via Zoom
1.	**CALL TO ORDER**	Mayor Pederson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Mayor Pederson stated the Land Acknowledgement, as presented.
2.	**AGENDA** 135-26	**MOVED** by Mayor Pederson that the agenda for the September 22, 2026, regular meeting of Council be approved with the following addition: **11. Closed Session** - Email Breach. **CARRIED**
3.	**MINUTES** 136-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that the minutes for the Tuesday, August 25th, 2026 Regular Meeting of Council be approved, as presented. **CARRIED**
	137-2026	**MOVED** by Mayor Pederson that the minutes for the Tuesday, August 25, 2026 Organizational Meeting be approved, as presented. **CARRIED**
4.	**APPOINTMENT**	N/A
5.	**BYLAW**	N/A

APPROVED

6.	**BUSINESS**	
	138-26	**MOVED** by Mayor Pederson to authorize the attendance of Council and Administration to the Regional Municipalities meeting on October 23, 2026 in Alberta Beach. **CARRIED**
	139-26	**MOVED** by Mayor Pederson that Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) funding be allocated as follows: $250.00 - Onoway Junior/Senior High School $245.00 – Rich Valley School $100.50 – Onoway Legion **CARRIED**
	140-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that Council accept the Weed Inspector, Jackie Gamblin's report, for information. **CARRIED**
	141-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter to accept the discussion on the A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy as information AND FURTHER that the following changes be made to said policy: • Add $150.00 application fee • Require a yearly application • Application deadline of February 1, 2026 • Administration receives a copy of approved Temporary Field Authorization (TFA) permit • Municipal address is to be posted on temporary dock • Applications will be accepted on a first come, first served basis AND FURTHER that these changes be posted to the home page on the website, an AllNet Communication is sent out and a notice through WhatsApp is sent out AND FURTHER that the amended A-COM-DOCK-1 Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy be brought back to the October Regular Council meeting. **CARRIED**
	142-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter to accept the letters from West Inter Lake District (WILD) Water Commission on their Draft Budget 2027, Member Engagement Opportunity and Phase 5(a) Capital Costs and Payment Options for information AND FURTHER THAT the Summer Village of Nakamun Park pay their apportioned share of capital costs upfront and be covered under the 2026 or 2027 Building Canada Strong Fund. **CARRIED**

UNAPPROVED

7.	**FINANCIAL** 143-26	**MOVED** by Councillor Gerta that Council accepts the payables listing, income and expense statements and bank reconciliation as at August 31, 2026, for information, as presented this day, September 22, 2026. **CARRIED**
8.	**COUNCIL REPORTS** 144-26	**MOVED** by Mayor Pederson that the Summer Village of Nakamun Park provide a donation of up to $350.00 for the 2026 Association of Summer Villages (ASVA) Annual Conference Silent Auction. **CARRIED**
	145-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that Council accepts the Council Reports for information, as presented. **CARRIED**
9.	**ADMINISTRATION/ PUBLIC WORKS/ DEVELOPMENT OFFICER REPORTS** 146-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Pederson to accept the quotes provided by Limb Walkers Tree Care Ltd. for information. **CARRIED** Tony Sonnleitner joined the meeting via Zoom at 3:00 p.m.
	147-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that Council accepts the Development Officers report as presented, AND THAT the following properties require further action: • 5098 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development • 5099 4 St - Council, despite unfortunate burning of debris on-site, allow landowner to continue development • 5100 4 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address shed, logs, and overgrown state of Lands. • 5052 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed that has been moved in and rehash issue with two RVs. • 5054 5 St - In light of a new Court ruling, DO recommend no action on fencing until matter addresses in MDP. • 5065 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the shed and the RV.

UNAPPROVED

		• 5066 5 St - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the two sheds; ignore fence at this time. • 5001 Hillcrest - DO to issue new STOP Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands. • 5032 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the three sheds and a deck. • 5033 6 St - DO to issue STOP Order to address the RV, deck, and play structure. • 5634 6 St - DO to issue ENFORCEMENT Order to address the overgrown state of the Lands. **CARRIED** Wendy Wildman left the meeting at 3:18 p.m. Tony Sonnleitner left the meeting at 3:37 p.m.
	148-26	**MOVED** by Councillor Gertz that Council accepts the Administration, Public Works and Development Officer reports for information, as presented. **CARRIED**
10.	**INFORMATION / CORRESPONDENCE** 149-26	**MOVED** by Councillor Gertz that Council accepts the following correspondence items as information: a) Alberta Municipalities (ABMunis) – August 11, 2026 – Insurance and Risk Services, Semi-Annual Review – 2026 Review of Summer Village of Nakamun Park Service b) Government of Canada, Michael Cooper, Member of Parliament St. Albert-Sturgeon River – August 17, 2026 – Congratulations on 60th Anniversary of Summer Village of Nakamun Park. c) Municipal Affairs, Grants and Taxation – September 3, 2026 – Preliminary Equalized Assessment (2026) report, for summer villages showing proposed changes. **CARRIED**
11.	**CLOSED MEETING** 150-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that pursuant to section 197(2) of the Municipal Government Act, Council go into a closed meeting session at 3:43 p.m. to discuss the following: a) Email Breach – Access to Information Act (ATIA) Section 19(1) **CARRIED** The closed meeting recessed at 3:44 p.m.

UNAPPROVED

		(no public were in attendance) The closed meeting re-convened at 3:45 p.m. The following individuals were present at the Closed Meeting: Keith Pederson Bob Charter Ray Gertz Sandra Schneider
	151-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that Council return to an open meeting at 3:54 p.m. **CARRIED**
		(no public returned to the meeting) The meeting reconvened at 3:55 p.m.
	152-26	**MOVED** by Deputy Mayor Charter that the matter of the Email Breach be brought back to the next Council meeting. **CARRIED**
12.	**NEXT MEETING**	The next Regular Council Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 27, 2026, at 2:00 p.m.
13.	**ADJOURNMENT**	Mayor Pederson declared the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

_____
Mayor Keith Pederson

_____
Chief Administrative Officer Wendy Wildman

UNAPPROVED

BYLAW 2026-7
BEING A BYLAW OF THE SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK, IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, FOR THE PURPOSE SPECIFIED IN SECTION 256 OF THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ACT

WHEREAS the Council of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park (hereinafter called the "Corporation") in the Province of Alberta, considers it necessary to have secured prearranged borrow for certain sums of money for the purpose of an operating Line of Credit for interim financing in the event of a local emergency or to cover unforeseen urgent operating expenditures not included in the operating budget over the period from the date of this Bylaw through to December 31, 2027;

WHEREAS Section 251 of the Municipal Government Act allows for municipalities to undertake borrowing so long as that borrowing is authorized by bylaw and incorporated the prescribed details set out in Section 251;

WHEREAS Section 256 of the Municipal Government Act establishes the provisions by which a municipality may undertake borrowing for operational expenditures, and that bylaws securing such borrowing do not need to be advertised so long as the term of the borrowing does not exceed three years;

AND WHEREAS the Summer Village of Nakamun Park's banking institution, ATB Financial, renews operating Lines of Credit annually (hence a borrowing term of one year);

NOW THEREFORE pursuant to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, it is hereby enacted by the Council of the Corporation as a Bylaw that:

1. The Corporation is hereby authorized to borrow from ATB Financial, ("ATB") up to the principal sum of $150,000.00 repayable upon demand at a rate of interest per annum from time to time established by ATB, not to exceed 10%, and such interest will be calculated daily and due and payable monthly on the last day of each and every month.

2. The borrowing is a line of credit repayable on demand and the Corporation is required to pay accrued interest monthly.

3. The Chief Elected Officer and the Chief Administrative Officer are authorized for and on behalf of the Corporation:
   a) to apply to ATB for the aforesaid loan to the Corporation and to arrange with ATB the amount, terms and conditions of the loan and security or securities to be given to ATB;

b) in preparation of security for any money borrowed from ATB

i. to execute promissory notes and other negotiable instruments or evidences of debt for such loans and renewals of all such promissory notes and other negotiable instruments or evidences of debts;

ii. to give or furnish to ATB all such securities and promises as ATB may require to secure repayment of such loans and interest thereon; and

iii. to execute all security agreements, hypothecations, debentures, charges, pledges, conveyances, assignments and transfers to and in favour of ATB of all or any property, real or personal, moveable or immovable, now or hereafter owned by the Corporation or in which the Corporation may have any interest, and any other documents or contracts necessary to give or to furnish to ATB the security or securities required by it.

4. The source or sources of money to be used to repay the principal and interest owing under the borrowing from ATB are: Taxes, Reserves, Grants

5. The amount to be borrowed and the term of the loan will not exceed any restrictions set forth in the Municipal Government Act.

6. In the event that the Municipal Government Act permits extension of the term of the loan and in the event the Council of the Corporation decides to extend the loan and ATB is prepared to extend the loan, any renewal or extension, bill, debenture, promissory note, or other obligation executed by the officers designated in paragraph 3 hereof and delivered to ATB will be valid and conclusive proof as against the Corporation of the decision of the Council to extend the loan in accordance with the terms of such renewal or extension, bill, debenture, promissory note, or other obligation, and ATB will not be bound to inquire into the authority of such officers to execute and deliver any such renewal, extension document or security.

7. This Bylaw comes into force on the final passing thereof.

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Bylaw was duly passed by the Council of the Corporation therein mentioned at a duly and regularly constituted meeting thereof held on the 27th day of October, 2026 at which a quorum was present, as entered in the minutes of the said Council, and that the Bylaw has come into force and is still in full force and effect.

THIS MUNICIPAL BORROWING BYLAW, inclusive of its Certificate: (a) may be executed electronically; and (b) may be delivered by email, facsimile or other functionally-equivalent means.

READ a first time this 27th day of October, 2026.

READ a second time this 27th day of October, 2026.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT to proceed to third reading this 27th day of October, 2026.

READ a third and final time this 27th day of October, 2026.

SIGNED this 27th day of October, 2026.

WITNESS our hands and the seal of the Corporation this 27th day of October, 2026.

_____

Mayor, Keith Pederson

_____

Chief Administrative Officer, Wendy Wildman

BYLAW 2026-8
BEING A BYLAW OF THE SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK, IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, FOR THE PURPOSE SPECIFIED IN SECTION 256 OF THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ACT

WHEREAS the Council of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park (hereinafter called the "Corporation") in the Province of Alberta, may make a credit card borrowing for the purpose of financing operating expenditures of the municipality, provided that the amount to be borrowed, together with the unpaid principal of other borrowings made for the purpose of financing operating expenditures, must not exceed the amount the municipality estimates will be raised in taxes in the year the borrowing is made.

AND WHEREAS further provides that a credit card borrowing bylaw does not have to be advertised if the term of the borrowing does not exceed 3 years.

NOW THEREFORE under the authority of the Municipal Government Act RSA 2000, Chpt. M-26, the Council of the Corporation as a Bylaw that:

PART 1: DEFINITIONS

1.1 "Act" means the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, Chpt. M-26;

1.2 "AMSC" means Alberta Municipal Services Corporation

1.3 "BMO" means the Bank of Montreal;

1.4 "Chief Administrative Officer" means the Chief Administrative Officer of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park;

1.5 "Mayor" means the chief elected official of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park;

1.6 "Corporation" means the municipality the Summer Village of Nakamun Park;

1.7 "PCard" means the BMO Mastercard

PART 2: BORROWING TERMS AND CONDITIONS

2.1 The Corporation may borrow from AMSC using the PCard to complete operating expenditures for convenience purposes and where required by suppliers.

2.2 The Corporation may borrow, at maximum, $5,000.00 (Five Thousand Dollars and 00/100 cents) from AMSC using the PCard.

2.3 The Corporation may borrow, at maximum, $5,000.00 (Five Thousand Dollars and 00/100 cents) from AMSC using the PCard for a single purchase.

2.4 All sums borrowed under this bylaw shall be borrowed on the general credit and security of the Corporation.

2.5 All sums borrowed under this bylaw, including principal and interest, shall be due and payable in full monthly.

2.6 Any and all sums borrowed with the PCard to complete operating expenditures for convenience purposes and where required by suppliers will be at the Chief Administrative Officer's discretion.

2.7 The Chief Administrative Officer and the Mayor of the Corporation are hereby authorized to apply to AMSC and to obtain a PCard with a limit and conditions not exceeding the maximum amount this bylaw authorizes.

2.8 This Bylaw comes into force and has effect on the date of third and final reading.

READ a first time this 27th day of October, 2026.

READ a second time this 27th day of October, 2026.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT to proceed to third reading this 27th day of October, 2026.

READ a third and final time this 27th day of October, 2026.

SIGNED this 27th day of October, 2026.

WITNESS our hands and the seal of the Corporation this 27th day of October, 2026.

_____

Mayor, Keith Pederson

_____

Chief Administrative Officer, Wendy Wildman

Summer Village Of Nakamun Park

Administrative Policy

Number	Title			
A-COM-DOCK-1	**Temporary Dock and Mooring Request Policy**			
Approval	**Originally Approved**		**Last Revised**	
	Resolution No:	42 - 23	**Resolution No:**	
	Date:	April 19th, 2023	**Date:**	

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is promote a transparent, consistent and efficient approach to the receipt, review and approval of requests related to dock and mooring placements on Nakamun Lake. This policy is not intended to supersede provincial jurisdiction, but rather reinforce the provincial approvals process for Temporary Field Authorizations in so far as the municipality's roll as an adjacent landowner on certain applications. Council wants to ensure that when the municipality has an obligation to participate in this process, there is a reasonable standard and consistent approach all parties can rely on.

Policy Statement

The Summer Village of Nakamun Park recognizes the desire for residents to participate in recreational use of Nakamun Lake, but also respects that there is a provincially regulated process in place for the approval of such uses and certain structures that may be sited in the Lake. Where the provincial approvals process for Temporary Field Authorizations now incorporates (as of 2018) the necessity to include consent (or a letter of no objection) from adjacent landowners on certain applications, and where the municipality is at times the adjacent landowner and must receive and review such requests, Council is desirous of a policy to promote a transparent and consistent approach to review same.

Standards

1. Residents must be aware, and such be reminded where necessary, that jurisdiction for matters on Nakamun Lake are under the purview of the Province of Alberta, and administrated by the designated ministry (Environment and Protected Areas, 2023). As such, the permit and approvals process for dock and mooring approvals, particularly applications for a Temporary Field Authorization, are made through the provincial department.

2. The Summer Village does not have any authority to establish or regulate the design standards, use, or location of docks or moorings within Nakamun Lake. However, the municipality does have an interest in ensuring that where the use of such installations has, or could reasonably have, an

impact on lands under the jurisdiction of the municipality a standard is established and followed to review and protect this interest for the common good of the community. In exercising this standard there must be an allowance for participation by Council, Administration, the Applicant, and where necessary the Provincial Department as this will encourage the more agreeable outcome respectful of all stakeholder interests.

3. As such, in making an application for the installation of a dock or mooring in Nakamun Lake, the following process will be encouraged:

    a. The Applicant (person requesting the installation) shall open a file with the provincial department on the matter, and complete the necessary permit application for same. No works shall be commenced until the permit is approved. To help facilitate this the municipality will make a reasonable effort to share the most recent regulation and application links to the provincial department (website, contact information, etc.) in the annual newsletters and on the municipal website.

    b. Where the application for a permit requires the consent of an adjacent landowner, and where that adjacent landowner is the municipality of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, the Applicant shall request, in writing to the Chief Administrative Officer, a Letter of No Objection for their application. The request shall include details on the applicants name, contact information, intended location and design of the installation, as well as details on which municipal lands the installation are adjacent to and likely to impact. The ~~request shall also state the timeframe (in years) the Letter of No Objection~~ A $150.00 fee paid to the Summer Village of Nakamun Park will also be required~~is being sought for~~.

    c. On receipt of a request for Letter of No Objection, and the $150.00 fee, the Chief Administrative Officer will confirm receipt of the request with the Applicant, check to see if the requested location is available, and arrange to have the request placed on the next available council meeting agenda for review by Council. If requests are received within 7 days of the next regularly scheduled council meeting, it is purely at the discretion of the Chief Administrative Officer if the subject request can yet be added to that agenda, or will have to wait until the next most immediate meeting. The deadline for submitting requests for the Letter of No Objection is February 1, of the year in which the request is being made.

    d. All requests for a Letter of No Objection shall be reviewed by Council and may be either approved, denied, or deferred for lack of information. Council shall not arbitrarily withhold review or approval of a request, but may consider relevant factors in making their decision, including:

i. Suitability of the noted adjacent lands for the expected impact on an adjacent installation;

ii. Applicant status as a Resident or Property Owner in the Municipality, where favour consideration shall be preferred to residents and property owners;

iii. Applicant parcel status as Improved or Vacant, where favourable consideration shall be preferred to applicants who own/reside on Improved parcels rather than Vacant parcels in the municipality;

iv. Historical records on the applicant in same or similar past uses in the community, for example any history of excessive noise complaints, abuse of municipal property, etc.;

v. Where the applicant is a resident or property owner in the municipality, any outstanding administrative, development, or legal obligations that would warrant withholding an approval of a Letter of No Objection. For example, property is tax arrears, or subject to a development Stop Order or Enforcement shall be denied their request;

vi. Any other matter Council deems appropriate, so long as that matter is not arbitrary and can be impartially applied to the review of other applications.

e. Having reviewed a request for Letter of No Objection, Council shall motion to approve, deny or defer a decision for lack of information. Where denied or deferred, Council shall clearly state the reason for same in the Motion. When approving a request, the Council may attach any conditions it deems appropriate relating to the use of the municipal lands (for example, requesting that the dock be located to promote access from the side of the subject parcel, rather than down the middle of it). ~~In approving a request, Council shall also stipulate a time frame for which the approval is active, ranging from the current calendar year to a maximum time of up to five (5) calendar years from the date of approval, inclusive of the current year.~~

f. Once a decision is made by Council, the Chief Administrative Officer will make a reasonable effort to advise the Applicant of the Decision as soon as possible. As a guideline for this, the Chief Administrative Officer should make every effort to provide a reply, in writing, to the Applicant within two (2) weeks of the date of decision. If the decision is to defer for lack of information, the notice of decision should include the next

council meeting date and advise that this is the next earliest time the request will be reviewed.

4. ~~In consideration of Standard 3(e), above, Council has the full discretion to approve a Letter of No Objection for any period up to five (5) calendar years such that it may deem appropriate.~~ For all ~~initiation~~ application approvals (by Applicant Name, not Applicant Property), Council shall approve a one (1) year Letter of No Objection. The Applicant must apply yearly for the Letter of No Objection. ~~For any consecutive subsequent years (renewals), Council may extend the approval to multiple years at its sole discretion, based on factors it deems appropriate. This will provide balance in that it cuts down on administrative time for the municipality, the applicant, and the provincial department, but also gives Council the ability to manage approvals to match the impact of same within the community.~~

5. Post approval obligations of the stakeholders are also important:

   a. The Applicant shall be required to provide updated information (contact information) ~~annually, as may be necessary for any multi-year approvals, on or before April 15th of each year~~. The Applicant must also provide the Municipality with a copy of the Temporary Field Authorization permit approval and any changes to same for the municipal land file within thirty (30) days of the Applicant's receipt of same. The municipal address of the Applicant MUST be displayed on the Dock and/or Mooring.

   b. The Municipality shall monitor the use of the subject lands in relation to the Applicant's installation as part of the regular development inspection and enforcement process. Where inconsistencies between the permit approval and the use arise, the municipality should advise the provincial department of same, and where inconsistencies between the use and the Letter of No Objection approval arise, the municipality shall arrange for a review of the matter by Council. When considering inconsistencies or changes to the use, Council shall maintain the sole discretion to honour the previous approval, amend the approval, or revoke the approval.

   c. Failure to comply with the conditions of the permit, the Letter of No Objection or other municipal bylaw may be considered sufficient to revoke the municipality's Letter of No Objection. On review by Council of such a condition, the revoked approval shall be immediate and the notice of same shall be provided to the provincial authority as soon as possible by the Chief Administrative Officer.

Legal References:

Cross References:

DRAFT

Revisions:

Resolution Number	MM/DD/YY
	10/22/26

DRAFT

THIS IS A BYLAW OF THE SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK, IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, TO BE KNOWN AS THE SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK FEES & CHARGES BYLAW.

WHEREAS, in accordance with the *Municipal Government Act,* a municipality has the authority to establish fees and charges for the provision of goods and services;

AND WHEREAS, the Summer Village of Nakamun Park wishes to establish, in a bylaw, certain fees and charges.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, in the Province of Alberta, duly assembled, enacts as follows:

1. That this Bylaw may be cited as the "FEES and CHARGES BYLAW".

2. That the Summer Village of Nakamun Park shall charge fees, charges, and penalties as established in:

   a. Schedule A, 'General Administrative Fees and Charges,' attached;
   b. Schedule B, 'Assessment Fees and Charges,' attached;
   c. Schedule C, 'Development and Planning Fees and Charges,' attached;
   d. Schedule D, 'Fire Services Bylaw Fees and Charges,' attached.
   e. Schedule E, ' Traffic Control Bylaw Penalties, Fees and Charges,' attached.
   f. Schedule F, 'Land Use Bylaw Penalties for Offences,' attached.

3. Should any provision of this bylaw be invalid, then such provision shall be severed, and the remainder of the bylaw shall remain in force.

4. Bylaw #2025-9 is hereby repealed.

5. THAT this BYLAW shall come into force and have effect on the date of the third and final reading.

Read a first time on this _____ day of _____, 2026.

Read a second time on this _____ day of _____, 2026.

Unanimous Consent to proceed to third reading on this _____ day of _____, 2026.

Read a third and final time on this _____ day of _____, 2026.

Signed this _____ day of _____, 2026.

_____

Mayor, Keith Pederson

_____

Chief Administrative Officer, Wendy Wildman

SCHEDULE 'A' – BYLAW #2026-X – FEES and CHARGES	SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK
GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE FEES AND CHARGES	
ADMINISTRATIVE FEES AND CHARGES	
LETTER OF NO OBJECTION – TEMPORARY DOCK AND MOORING REQUEST	$150
REQUEST FOR COPIES OF VILLAGE DOCUMENTS PER REQUEST	$25
COST OF COPIES PER COPY	$0.50
SPECIAL SERVICES RATE PER HOUR	$75
TAX CERTIFICATE	$50
WEBSITE ADVERTISING FEE (ANNUAL, BUSINESS CARD SIZE)	$100
~~WASTE COLLECTION TOKENS (Per Token (2019), As Amended By Highway 43 East Waste Commission From Time To Time)~~	~~$1.75~~ ----------
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

DRAFT

SCHEDULE 'B' – BYLAW #2026-X – FEES and CHARGES	**SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK**
ASSESSMENT FEES AND CHARGES	
ASSESSMENT FEES AND CHARGES	
ASSESSMENT APPEAL FEE (Refundable if applicant is successful) (Matters Relating To Assessment Complaints Regulation, 2018, Alberta Regulation 201/2017 & Section 481(1) of the MGA)	$50
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

DRAFT

SCHEDULE 'C' – BYLAW #2026-X – FEES and CHARGES	SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING FEES AND CHARGES	
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING – ADMINISTRATIVE FEES AND CHARGES	
LETTER OF COMPLIANCE - STANDARD	$95
LETTER OF COMPLIANCE – RUSH (Within 72 Hours)	$190
PLAN CANCELLATION BYLAW (Lot Consolidation)	$400
PLAN CANCELLATION BYLAW REGISTRATION	$35
CURRENT LAND TITLE CERTIFICATE (Cost Per Title Requested)	$15
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING - RE-DISTRICTING/RE-ZONING FEES/AMENDMENT FEES	
RE-DISTRICTING APPLICATION	$2,000
AMEND MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN	$2,000
AMEND LAND USE BYLAW	$2,000
AMEND PROVISION OF A STATUTORY PLAN	$2,000
ADOPTION OF NEW STATUTORY PLAN	$2,000
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING – APPEAL FEES AND CHARGES	
DEVELOPMENT APPEAL FEE (Refundable if applicant is successful)	$1,000
SUBDIVISION APPEAL FEE	$1,000
STOP ORDER APPEAL FEE (MGA Section 645 Matters)	$1,000
ORDER TO REMEDY APPEAL FEE (MGA Sections 545, 546 Matters)	$1,000
DEVELOPMENT – PERMIT FEES AND CHARGES	
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS – DWELLINGS, PERMITTED	$300
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT – DWELLING, DISCRETIONARY	$500
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS – ADDITIONS, PERMITTED	$150
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS – ADDITIONS, DISCRETIONARY	$300
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS – ACCESSORY USE, GENERAL	$150
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT - ACCESSORY USE: SECONDARY SUITE, GARDEN, OR GARAGE SUITE - PERMITTED	$300
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT - ACCESSORY USE: SECONDARY SUITE, GARDEN, OR GARAGE SUITE - DISCRETIONARY	$500
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT – ACCESSORY USE, RECREATIONAL VEHICLE SITE PERMIT (PER RV SITE)	$150
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS – HOME OFFICE/HOME OCCUPATION	$150

DEVELOPMENT PERMITS - SEPTIC, CISTERN, FENCE, DECK, SIGNS (PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY)	$50
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS - DEMOLITION	$50
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS - COMMERCIAL	$200
SCHEDULE C (CONTINUED)...	
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING - SAFETY CODES FEES	
BUILDING PERMITS	AS PER SAFETY CODES SERVICE PROVIDER FEES AGREEMENT
ELECTRICAL PERMITS	
PLUMBING PERMITS	
GAS & HEATING PERMITS	
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING - SUB-DIVISION FEES (MUNICIPALITY)	
LOT SUBDIVISION FEE FOR LOTS THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY CONSOLIDATED:	
-FIRST LOT	$1,000
-EACH SUBSEQUENT LOT	$500
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING - SUB-DIVISION FEES (SUBDIVISION AUTHORITY)	
SUBDIVISION FEES AT APPLICATION FOR UP TO 3 LOTS, INCLUDING ANY REMAINDER	$750 + $250 per lot
EXTENSION - THE EXTENSION REQUEST AND FEE MUST BE RECEIVED BEFORE THE FILE EXPIRES. **ONCE A FILE HAS EXPIRED, AN EXTENSION CANNOT BE PROCESSED, AND A NEW SUBDIVISION APPLICATION WILL BE REQUIRED.**	$350
RE-CIRCULATION	$250
FEE AT ENDORSEMENT **Endorsement fees are charged at time of endorsement for all subdivisions except separation of titles**	$200 per lot
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

SCHEDULE 'D' – BYLAW #2026-X – FEES and CHARGES	SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK
FIRE SERVICES BYLAW FEES AND CHARGES	
FIRE SERVICES BYLAW – ADMINISTRATIVE FEES AND CHARGES	
FIRE PERMIT FEE (SECTION 22)	$250
FIRE SERVICES BYLAW ADMINISTRATIVE SURCHARGE FEE (SECTION 2(w))	5%
FIRE SERVICES BYLAW – PENALTIES FOR OFFENCES	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE FIRE SERVICES BYLAW IS LIABLE TO A PENALTY NOT LESS THAN THAT ESTABLISHED IN THIS PART AND NOT EXCEEDING $10,000.00.	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE FIRE SERVICES BYLAW WHERE NO PENALTY HAS BEEN SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED IS LIABLE TO A FINE OF NOT LESS THAN $100.00 AND NOT EXCEEDING $10,000.00.	
SECTION 10 OFFENCE - LIGHT, CAUSE, OR PERMIT TO BE LIT A FIRE WITHOUT A FIRE PERMIT	$250
SECTION 11 OFFENCE - BURN OR CAUSE TO BE BURNED ANY PROHIBITED DEBRIS	$250
SECTION 12 OFFENCE - USE COAL, STRAW, OR USED OIL AS A HEAT SOURCE IN A RESIDENCE	$250
SECTION 13 OFFENCE - USE COAL, STRAW, OR OTHER MATERIALS FOR GROUND THAWING OR TEMPORARY HEATING	$250
SECTION 14 OFFENCE - USE A BURN BARREL OR INCINERATOR	$250
SECTION 15 OFFENCE - ALLOW A FIRE TO CREATE DENSE SMOKE OR OBNOXIOUS ODOR	$250
SECTION 21 OFFENCE - PROVIDE FALSE OR MISLEADING INFORMATION ON AN APPLICATION FOR A FIRE PERMIT	$500
SECTION 29 OFFENCE - FAIL TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF A FIRE PERMIT	$500
SECTION 30(A) OFFENCE - FAIL TO PRODUCE A FIRE PERMIT ON REQUEST	$500
SECTION 30(B) OFFENCE - FAIL TO KEEP THE FIRE AT THE SITE OF THE FIRE	$1,000
SECTION 34 OFFENCE - LIGHT, CAUSE, OR PERMIT TO BE LIT A FIRE WHEN A FIRE BAN IS IN PLACE	$1,000
SECTION 36 OFFENCE - SELL, STORE, USE, DISCHARGE, OR SET-OFF FIREWORKS	$500
SECTION 39 OFFENCE - FAILURE TO REPORT RELEASE OF DANGEROUS GOODS	$1,000
SECTION 40 OFFENCE - TRANSPORT DANGEROUS GOODS WITHOUT PROPER IDENTIFICATION AND ADHERENCE TO APPLICABLE REGULATIONS	$500
SECTION 41 OFFENCE - STORE, TRANSPORT, USE, OR RELEASE DANGEROUS GOODS IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS	$1000
SECTION 50 OFFENCE - INTERFERE OR OBSTRUCT AN ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, FIRE CHIEF, OR FIRE DEPARTMENT	$2,500
SECTION 51 OFFENCE - PROVIDE FALSE OR MISLEADING INFORMATION TO AN ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, THE FIRE CHIEF, OR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT	$2,500
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

SCHEDULE "E" – BYLAW 2026-X - PENALTIES, FEES and CHARGES	SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK
TRAFFIC BYLAW - PENALTIES FOR OFFENCES	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE TRAFFIC BYLAW IS LIABLE TO A PENALTY NOT LESS THAN THAT ESTABLISHED IN THIS PART AND NOT EXCEEDING $10,000.00	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE TRAFFIC BYLAW WHERE NO PENALTY HAS BEEN SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED IS LIABLE TO A FINE OF NOT LESS THAN $100.00 AND NOT EXCEEDING $10,000.00	
SECTION 3 (a) OFFENCE – ACT IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE DIRECTIONS OF A PEACE OFFICER OR MEMBER OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IN THE COURSE OF THEIR DUTIES	$500.00
SECTION 3 (b) OFFENCE – ACT IN CONTRAVENTION OF A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE	$100.00
SECTION 4 OFFENCE – PARK AN OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE OR TRAILER, OR ANY UNATTACHED TRAILER ON A HIGHWAY	$100.00
SECTION 5 OFFENCE – PARK A VEHICLE ON THE TRAVELED PORTION OF ANY HIGHWAY	$100.00
SECTION 6 OFFENCE – PARK OUTSIDE OF THE LIMITS OF A MARKED PARKING SPACE	$100.00
SECTION 7 OFFENCE – PARK OR LEAVE A VEHICLE WITHOUT EXPRESS OR IMPLIED CONSENT OF OWNER OR PERSON IN CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY	$100.00
SECTION 8 (a) – (l) OFFENCE – STOP, PARK, OR LEAVE VEHICLE WHERE NOT PERMITTED	$100.00
SECTION 9 OFFENCE – PARK A RECREATIONAL VEHICLE WHERE PROHIBITED OR IN A MANNER NOT PERMITTED	$250.00
SECTION 10 OFFENCE – ABANDON A VEHICLE ON A HIGHWAY	$250.00
SECTION 11 OFFENCE – EXCEED SPEED LIMIT	$100.00
SECTION 13 OFFENCE – OPERATE SNOW VEHICLE ON TRAVELLED PORTION OF HIGHWAY	$150.00
SECTION 14 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WITHOUT REGISTRATION OR INSURANCE	$350.00
SECTION 15 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WHERE NOT PERMITTED	$100.00
SECTION 16 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ON HIGHWAY - NOT ON RIGHT SIDE OF ROAD OR NOT SINGLE FILE	$100.00
SECTION 17 OFFENCE – EXCEED SPEED LIMIT FOR OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES	$100.00
SECTION 18 OFFENCE – OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES – FAIL TO CROSS HIGHWAY AS REQUIRED	$100.00
SECTION 19 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WHERE NOT PERMITTED	$150.00

DRAFT

SCHEDULE "E" – BYLAW 2026-X - PENALTIES, FEES and CHARGES	**SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK**
TRAFFIC BYLAW - PENALTIES FOR OFFENCES	
BETWEEN APRIL 1 AND OCTOBER 31	
SECTION 20 (a) – (d) OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WITHOUT AN EXHAUST MUFFLER, AT LEAST ONE HEADLIGHT, OR AT LEAST ONE TAILLIGHT	$150.00
SECTION 21 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE DURING NIGHTIME OR LOW VISIBILITY WITHOUT HEADLIGHT AND TAILLIGHT ALIGHT.	$250.00
SECTION 22 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WITHOUT A SAFETY HELMET WHERE NOT EXEMPTED UNDER PROVINCIAL LAW	$250.00
SECTION 23 OFFENCE – OPERATE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE WHERE PROHIBITED BY A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE	$100.00
SECTION 28 OFFENCE – ATTEMPT TO DIRECT TRAFFIC, REGULATE TRAFFIC, OR PLACE ANYTHING RESEMBLING A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE	$250.00
SECTION 29 OFFENCE – REMOVE, DAMAGE, OR TAMPER WITH A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE	$250.00
SECTION 34 OFFENCE – OPERATE HEAVY VEHICLE WITHOUT A VALID ROAD USE PERMIT	$250.00
SECTION 35 OFFENCE – OPERATE HEAVY VEHICLE IN CONTRAVENTION OF CONDITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS OF A ROAD USE PERMIT	$250.00
SECTION 37 OFFENCE – OPERATE VEHICLE WITH METAL SPIKES, CLEATS, LUGS OR BANDS PROJECTING FROM THE WHEEL, TIRE, OR TREAD	$500.00
SECTION 38 OFFENCE – OPERATE VEHICLE WITH CATERPILLAR TREAD/TRACK ON A HIGHWAY WITHOUT PERMISSION, OR OPERATE IN CONTRAVENTION OF SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS TO A PERMISSION	$500.00
SECTION 40 (a) – (b) OFFENCE – PARK VEHICLE ON A HIGHWAY IN A MANNER THAT BLOCKS OR OBSTRUCTS TRAFFIC OR RESTRICTS OR BLOCKS ACCESS TO A BUILDING	$150.00
SECTION 41 OFFENCE– PLACE RESTRICTED MATERIAL ON ANY ROADWAY	$250.00
SECTION 42 – OFFENCE – CONGREGATE, CROWD OR HARASS A PERSON IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO INTERFERE WITH MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC ON A HIGHWAY	$250.00
SECTION 43 (a) – (c) OFFENCE – OPERATE HEAVY VEHICLE WHERE PROHIBITED OR OTHERWISE NOT IN COMPLIANCE	$250.00
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

DRAFT

SCHEDULE "F" – BYLAW 2026-X - FEES and CHARGES	**SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK**
LAND USE BYLAW - PENALTIES FOR OFFENCES	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE LAND USE BYLAW IS LIABLE TO A PENALTY NOT LESS THAN THAT ESTABLISHED IN THIS PART AND NOT EXCEEDING $10,000.00	
A PERSON WHO IS FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE UNDER THE LAND USE BYLAW WHERE NO PENALTY HAS BEEN SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED IS LIABLE TO A FINE OF NOT LESS THAN $250.00	
DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO PERMIT APPROVAL	$500.00
NON-COMPLIANCE WITH DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CONDITIONS	$500.00
FAIL TO COMPLY WITH AN ORDER	$500.00
CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT AFTER DEVELOPMENT PERMIT HAS EXPIRED OR BEEN CANCELLED OR SUSPENDED	$500.00
RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PLACED ON UNDEVELOPED PARCEL	$500.00
EXCEED NUMBER OF PERMITTED RECREATIONAL VEHICLES ON A PARCEL	$500.00
GST will be charged where applicable on all Fees and Charges listed	

Penalty amounts for contravention of the same provisions of the Bylaw that occur within 12 months are:

- Double for a second offence; and
- Triple for third and subsequent offences.

DRAFT

cao@svnakamun.com

From: Summer Village Office <administration@wildwillowenterprises.com>
Sent: August 13, 2026 12:59 AM
To: cao@svnakamun.com
Subject: Re: To do list from NP Council meeting

Hi Sandra, please see below grant funding information for Nakamun Park:

2026 Funding Remaining in Local Government Fiscal Fund (LGFF) - **$56,480** (have budgeted $11,480 to do a traffic safety project in 2026 using LGFF funds - we have nothing coded to this project yet - **do you know if this project is going ahead?)**(If so, we would have to decrease the remaining funding by the project amount).
2027 LGFF Allocation - **$71,355**

2026 Funding Remaining in Canada Community Building Fund (CCBF) - **$9,693** (have budgeted the 2026 Allocation to do a General Dust Control project - we have nothing coded to this project yet - **do you know if this project is going ahead?)**(If so, we would have to decrease the remaining funding by the project amount).
2027 Build Communities Strong Fund – Community Stream (BCSF) - Allocation is unknown - it would a good estimate to base the allocation on the previous year's amount **$9,693**

LGFF - The construction of a pickle ball court would be an eligible activity under LGFF where it would fall under the following category:
1.p) Parks, Sport, and Recreation Assets related to operations of facilities and related programming for recreational opportunities, including:
• Recreational and sports facilities, including baseball diamonds, swimming pools, ski areas
• Campground facilities
• Playgrounds and equipment
• Permanent park facilities
• Public wharves, docks, and piers
• Trail systems
• Ice resurfacers

The outcome of the pickle ball court would be to improve community activity which is identified as a primary outcome of the LGFF funding.

BCSF - The construction of a pickle ball court would be an eligible project under LGFF where it would fall under the following categories:
1.m) Sport Infrastructure • Amateur sports facilities, for example: hockey rinks and arenas, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, ski areas, etc. Note: excludes facilities, including arenas, which would be used as the home of professional sports teams or major junior hockey teams (e.g., Western Hockey League)
1.n) Recreational Infrastructure
• Playgrounds and equipment
• Permanent park facilities
• Public wharves, docks, and piers

• Trail systems

Note: These capital grants would fund the capital purchases and construction required to build the pickle-ball court(s). Any funds required for annual operations and routine annual maintenance would have to come from the annual operating budget.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank you,

Heather Luhtala,
Financial Officer/Grant Funding Coordinator
Email: administration@wildwillowenterprises.com
Phone: 587-873-5765 Fax: 780-967-0431

Note: The new administration email for Silver Sands is admin@summervillageofsilversands.com

This email is intended only for the use of the party to which it is addressed and for the intended purpose. This email contains information that is privileged, confidential, and/or protected by law and is to be held in the strictest confidence. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying, or distribution of this email or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

This is Administration's latest version of the report:

Pickleball Project Update October 2026

As stated in previous communications.

Council's proposal to build a Pickleball court has received a strong mandate to proceed.

The respondents to the survey are:

70% unequivocally in favor.

22% in favor contingent on the village receiving all or partial grant funding.

8% against the proposal.

Council decided to postpone the project to ensure our financial situation remained strong before committing to the project. At the information meeting in July, there were also some questions about the impact of the project on tax rates and whether grants could be used to fund the project.

Grants

Capital Grant funding is provided once a project has been approved and the required annual reporting has been completed and certified.

The Village has five years to spend each grant allocation. While the Village can build up funds with the Government of Alberta, the funds must be used within the five-year period.

The Capital Grants we get, do qualify for a Pickleball court project according to our Village Financial Officer/Grant funding Coordinator, Heather Luhtala.

This year the village qualified for $69,967 through the (LGFF) Local government Fiscal Fund and $9,693 through the (BSCF) Building Strong Communities Fund. The village currently has $56,480 available under LGFF and $9,693 available under BSCF although it is anticipated we will use approximately $6,000 for new signage leaving about $60,000.

For the next fiscal year, we anticipate being again eligible for approximately $80,000 between the 2 grants. In total, we will have approximately $140,000 available for capital projects.

It is anticipated we will use approximately $12,000 for Road Dust control and approximately $6,600 for the WILD Water phase 5A upfront Debenture cost leaving around $121,400 available for new projects. The Pickleball budget was $66,000, however council plans on adding permanent basketball hoops and allow an inflation contingency so we will budget $75,000 still leaving a considerable amount available for future projects.

The cost to maintain the courts will be minimum in the first few years but we estimate an allowance of $1,500 per year will cover replacing nets and repainting lines. This expenditure can be absorbed in our current budgets without reflecting higher taxation.

Over the winter council will obtain new quotations and further define the project.

MASG Service Update - Summer Village of Nakamun Park

From Travis Horne, AMAA, MAS, AIMA, CRA PApp, LAAS <Travis.Horne@masg.ca>
To cao@svnakamun.com <cao@svnakamun.com>
Cc Vanessa Vaughan, CAE, RES, MAAS, LAAS <Vanessa.Vaughan@masg.ca>
Date 2026-10-21 11:28

MileNet Assessor Appointment Walkthrough - Appointment.pdf (~140 KB)

Good morning Sandra,

I am excited to let you know that Vanessa Vaughan, CAE, RES, MAAS, LAAS will succeed Justin as your municipality's appointed assessor for the upcoming valuation cycle.

I have known Vanessa for approximately 15 years and have developed considerable respect for her experience, professionalism, and commitment to delivering high-quality assessment services. She is an exceptional and highly experienced assessment professional, bringing more than 23 years of mass-appraisal experience. This includes extensive work in municipal assessment leadership, revaluations, valuation modelling, assessment maintenance, commercial and residential valuation, property-owner inquiries, and assessment appeals. Her background includes serving as City Assessor for the City of Prince Albert and holding senior leadership roles with the Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency.

Vanessa is currently awaiting confirmation of her Accredited Municipal Assessor of Alberta (AMAA) designation. She already holds (among others) the Certified Assessment Evaluator (CAE) designation from the International Association of Assessing Officers, which is independently recognized as an assessor qualification under Alberta's *Qualifications of Assessor Regulation*. Accordingly, she meets Alberta's statutory qualification requirements to practise assessment and serve as an appointed assessor.
This change forms part of our ongoing effort to streamline service delivery. Vanessa's appointment will provide clear accountability, consistent communication, and greater continuity throughout the annual valuation, assessment-maintenance, inquiry, and appeal processes.

Best,

Municipal Assessment Services

masg.ca

Travis Horne, AMAA, MAS, AIMA, CRA PApp, LAAS
President | Municipal Assessment Services Group Inc.

Tel +17809393310;Ext=300
Direct 825-333-4870
Fax 780-939-3350
Email Travis.Horne@masg.ca

PO Box 60 Station Main, Ardrossan
Alberta, T8E 2A1, Canada

This communication is privileged and intended only for the addressee. Please advise sender immediately of receipt of error. Any other distribution or disclosure is prohibited.

Credit Items F: CASH - ATB NP

Date	Ref	Description	Amount
Sep 01,26		TAX FILING FEE	4.00
Sep 03,26		E-TRANSFER- FIRE RESCUE INTERN	2,061.28
Sep 03,26		E-TRANSFER- OMNP	400.00
Sep 03,26		E-TRANSFER- STANDSTONE WASTE	1,156.06
Sep 03,26		E-TRANSFER- STANDSTONE WASTE	126.01
Sep 03,26		E-TRANSFER- SMALL POWER	56.43
Sep 05,26		ON-LINE- UFA	253.46
Sep 10,26		RECEIVER GENERAL- AUGUST	1,906.92
Sep 14,26		E-TRANSFER- PCARD MCRD	359.83
Sep 14,26		E-TRANSFER- STANDSTONE WASTE	244.13
Sep 15,26		BRIAN SHABADA- AUGUST ADVANCE	1,500.00
Sep 22,26		DIRECT DEBIT- WCB	489.13
Sep 24,26		DIRECT DEBIT- SANG	54.58
Sep 29,26		DIRECT DEBIT- AMSC ENERGY	1,641.10
Sep 29,26		RAY GERTZ- REIMBURSE	100.00
Sep 29,26		EFT- LAC STE. ANNE COUNTY	1,573.56
Sep 29,26		SCHOOL	40,221.26
Sep 30,26		BRIAN SHABADA- SEPT PAYROLL	1,677.25
Sep 30,26		E-TRANSFER- WILDWILLOW ENTERPR	5,642.49
Sep 30,26		BANK FEES	24.80

Nakamun Park
September 2026 Payment Listing

Analysis: INCOME STATEMENT -NAKAMUN 000 00,00

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
INCOME STATEMENT -NAKAMUN	(1)	(2)	(3)
Period 1: --- Begin	Jan 01,26	Jan 01,26	Jan 01,26
End	Dec 31,26	Sep 30,26	Dec 31,26
--- Type	B	A	B
(less) --- Begin	000 00,00	000 00,00	Jan 01,26
Period 2: End	000 00,00	000 00,00	Sep 30,26
--- Type			A
Ratios: % of Account			
Graphs: # of Columns,Scale	0 0	0 0	0 0

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
REVENUE			
RESIDENTIAL TAXES-(MUNICIPAL)	188,810.82	188,520.24	290.58
RESIDENTIAL TAXES-(SCHOOL)	133,549.64	133,344.17	205.47
VACANT RES. TAXES-(MUNICIPAL)	7,383.90	7,383.90	0.00
VACANT RES. TAXES-(SCHOOL)	3,192.36	3,192.33	0.03
LINEAR- (MUNICIPAL)	3,398.38	3,398.38	0.00
LINEAR- (SCHOOL)	702.00	702.00	0.00
LINEAR- (DIP)	12.53	12.53	0.00
PROVINCIAL POLICING	10,434.00	10,418.41	15.59
SENIOR FOUNDATION	11,273.80	11,256.90	16.90
MINIMUM TAX CHARGE ($930.00)	32,218.90	32,218.94	0.04-
PROTECTIVE SERV LEVY($134.64)	23,427.00	23,427.36	0.36-
PROJECT LEVY	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL TAXES	414,403.33	413,875.16	528.17
PENALTIES & COSTS ON TAXES	0.00	4,811.84	4,811.84-
INVESTMENT INCOME (INTEREST)	3,500.00	5,049.14	1,549.14-
GRANT OPERATING (LGFF-O)	22,800.00	15,430.00	7,370.00
(15,800LGFF\7,000 H20 SAFETY)			
GRANT OPERATING (CSJ\STEP)	2,150.00	2,100.00	50.00
GRANT OPERATING (RETAIN FCSS)	1,536.00	0.00	1,536.00
GRANT CAPITAL (CCBF)	9,737.00	0.00	9,737.00
DUST CONTROL			
GRANT CAPITAL (LGFF)(LOAN)	13,487.00	0.00	13,487.00
GRANT CAPITAL (LGFF)(CAPPROJ)	11,480.00	0.00	11,480.00
TRAFFIC SAFETY			
LOAN PMNT REMAINDER(RESERVES)	13,749.00	0.00	13,749.00
LOAN PMNT INTEREST(RESERVES)	3,664.00	0.00	3,664.00
MISC.INCOME (SVREMP FIRE)	0.00	300.00	300.00-
OPER PROJ FUNDING (RES)	0.00	0.00	0.00
CAPITAL PROJ FUND (LGFF)(RES)	0.00	0.00	0.00
SPECIAL PROJ FUNDING (RES)	9,800.00	0.00	9,800.00
ADMIN			
SALES OF GOODS & SERVICES	0.00	1,388.67	1,388.67-
N.S.F. FEES	0.00	0.00	0.00
TAX CERTIFICATES\SEARCHES	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00-
GARBAGE TOKEN REVENUE	0.00	204.75	204.75-

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
AMSC LOYALTY	51.00	0.00	51.00
ELECTIONS TR.FR.RES	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRANS FROM RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT			
SUPERIOR SAFETY CODES	0.00	630.17	630.17-
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS	1,024.00	895.00	129.00
SDAB\ASSESSMENT APPEAL	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00-
TR.FR.RES\DEF.REV	0.00	0.00	0.00
EMERGENCY SERVICES			
FIRE INCIDENT RECOVERY	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS			
CONDITIONAL GRANTS	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRANTS FROM LOCAL AGENCIES	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRANSFER FROM RESERVE\DEF.REV.	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEWER\WATER\DRAINAGE\UTILITIES			
CONDITIONAL GRANTS	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRANSFER FROM RESERVE	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00
PARKS & RECREATION			
PROV GRANT(FCSS)	2,564.00	1,923.00	641.00
GRANT\DONATION - 50TH ANNIV	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRANT\DONATION - FORTIS	0.00	0.00	0.00
LIBRARY\TR.FR.RES	0.00	0.00	0.00
TR.FR.RES\DEF.REV(FCSS\50TH)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUE	511,445.33	448,607.73	62,837.60
REQUISITIONS			
SCHOOL	137,444.00	103,082.80	34,361.20
SENIOR FOUNDATION	11,273.80	11,273.80	0.00
UNDER\OVER UTILIZED LEVY	0.00	0.00	0.00
DIP REQUISITION	12.53	0.00	12.53
UNDER\OVER DIP LEVY	0.00	0.00	0.00
PROVINCIAL POLICING	10,434.00	8,024.00	2,410.00
TOTAL REQUISITIONS	159,164.33	122,380.60	36,783.73
NET REVENUE FOR MUN PURPOSES	352,281.00	326,227.13	26,053.87

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
EXPENSE STATEMENT- NAKAMUN	(1)	(2)	(3)
Period 1: - Begin	Jan 01,26	Jan 01,26	Jan 01,26
Period 1: - End	Dec 31,26	Sep 30,26	Dec 31,26
Period 1: - Type	B	A	B
(less) Period 2: - Begin	000 00,00	000 00,00	Jan 01,26
Period 2: - End	000 00,00	000 00,00	Sep 30,26
Period 2: - Type			A
Ratios: % of Account			
Graphs: # of Columns,Scale	0 0	0 0	0 0

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
COUNCIL			
HONORARIUMS	5,530.00	1,600.00	3,930.00
BOARD\COMMITTEE\SVLSACE\REG	2,400.00	1,905.60	494.40
EDUCATION & DEV. ALLOWANCE	922.00	0.00	922.00
TRAVEL\SUBSISTENCE	1,500.00	653.10	846.90
ASVA CONFERENCE	3,871.00	664.76	3,206.24
ABMUNIS CONFERENCE	0.00	0.00	0.00
ABMUNIS LEADERSHIP CAUCUS	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER CONFERENCE\CONVENTION	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT\SURVEYS	0.00	0.00	0.00
INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER SERV	0.00	0.00	0.00
(2026 INTEGRITY COMM OUT)			
TOTAL	15,223.00	4,823.46	10,399.54
ADMIN & STAFF			
ADMIN SERVICES CONTRACT	59,622.00	44,716.50	14,905.50
CAO SERVICES-DES.OFF.	0.00	0.00	0.00
CFO SERVICES-DES.OFF.	0.00	0.00	0.00
RECORDING SERVICES-DES.OFF.	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRANT MGMT SERVICES-CORE	0.00	0.00	0.00
CORPORATE PLANNING SERVICES	0.00	0.00	0.00
RECEPTION & RECORDS MGMT	0.00	0.00	0.00
MAP REVIEW\COMPLIANCE MGMT	0.00	0.00	0.00
WEBSITE MAINT & UPKEEP	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00-
STAFF DEVELOPMENT\TRAINING	0.00	0.00	0.00
STAFF BENEFITS(WCB & INSUR)	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONFERENCES & CONVENTIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRAVEL & SUBSITENCE	1,536.00	0.00	1,536.00
OFFICE RENT\COMM\EQUIP\INCI	4,800.00	2,700.00	2,100.00
ADMIN SUPPORT- SCOPE CHANGE	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
TOTAL	66,958.00	48,616.50	18,341.50
ADMIN CORPORATE SERVICES			
COPY\POSTAGE\STNARY\ADVERTI	3,002.00	2,498.76	503.24
OFFICE EQUIP\CAPITAL PURCH	250.00	0.00	250.00
WEBSITE,E-COMM,DIG.LIC,HOST	2,750.00	1,497.64	1,252.36

| Description | 2026 BUDGET | 2026 ACTUALS | VARIANCE |

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
MEMBERSHIPS(ASVA,ABMUNI,SV)	3,000.00	3,700.73	700.73-
FINANCIAL SOFTWARE (NV'S)	0.00	0.00	0.00
AUDITOR SERVICES	4,300.00	4,250.00	50.00
ASSESSMENT-MASG (DES.OFF.)	6,120.00	4,590.00	1,530.00
ASSESSMENT APPEAL (CRASC)	983.00	960.20	22.80
LEGAL COUNSEL (GEN\BYLAW)	1,053.00	1,884.15	831.15-
INSURANCE	8,644.00	8,644.00	0.00
WCB (MUNICIPAL)	1,878.00	1,462.46	415.54
BENEFITS (MUNICIPAL)	0.00	0.00	0.00
FINANCIAL INST\BANK FEES	717.00	253.85	463.15
TAX REBATES & CANCELLATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	32,697.00	29,741.79	2,955.21
PROTECTIVE & EMERGENCY SERVICE			
CPO & BYLAW ENF (SERVICE)	9,441.00	7,081.02	2,359.98
CPO & BYLAW ENF (MILEAGE)	0.00	0.00	0.00
CPO & BYLAW ENF (OTHER)	0.00	0.00	0.00
PROVINCAL POLICE REQ (GOA)	0.00	0.00	0.00
MOVED TO REQUISITIONS ON I\S			
2026 - 10,434			
2027 - 12,293			
2028 - 14,615			
2029 - 17,258			
2030 - 20,608			
EMERGENCY MGMT REG(SVREMP)	3,994.00	4,000.00	6.00-
EMERGENCY MGMT LOCAL DEM'S	1,229.00	500.00	729.00
EMERGENCY MGMT COURSE\TRAIN	450.00	0.00	450.00
EMERGENCY MGMT SUPPLY\KITS	0.00	0.00	0.00
	23,427.00	15,850.97	7,576.03
FIRE & PROTECTION (OPER)	0.00	0.00	0.00
FIRE & PROTECTION (OTHER)	0.00	0.00	0.00
PHYSICIAN RECRUITMENT (LSA)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	38,541.00	27,431.99	11,109.01
PUBLIC WORKS			
PW FOREPERSON (5K)	25,000.00	22,471.68	2,528.32
PW SUMMER & CASUAL LABOUR	7,500.00	6,718.40	781.60
PW HIRED & CASUAL LABOUR	0.00	0.00	0.00
PAYROLL & EMPLOYEE REMIT	2,282.00	1,777.00	505.00
PW TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT	0.00	0.00	0.00
PW EXPENSES & COMMUNICATION	300.00	0.00	300.00
PW TRAVEL & SUBSITANCE	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP COMMUNICATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP UTILITIES (SANG\EPCOR)	18,000.00	12,505.95	5,494.05
SHOP FACILITY MAINTENANCE	512.00	471.39	40.61
SHOP FACILITY REPAIR\MAJOR	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP SUPPLIES	2,560.00	1,408.73	1,151.27
SHOP SAFETY\PPE	300.00	0.00	300.00
Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
ROAD GRADING & MAINTENANCE	2,048.00	2,380.00	332.00-
ROAD SNOW PLOW\REMOVAL\SAND	2,048.00	0.00	2,048.00
ROAD GRAVEL & AGGREGATE	1,024.00	0.00	1,024.00
ROAD SIGN,SPEED BUMP,SAFETY	512.00	0.00	512.00
DRAINAGE CULVERT MATERIAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-TREE REMOVE	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-VEG MGMT	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-CLEANUP COM	750.00	0.00	750.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-WEED INS\AB	750.00	0.00	750.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-GEN SUPPLY	256.00	0.00	256.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-BOAT LAUNCH	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARKS\COMMON SP-FUEL	4,200.00	2,452.56	1,747.44
ANNUAL AMORTIZATION	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	68,042.00	50,185.71	17,856.29
EQUIPMENT & MACHINES			
GRADER MAINTENANCE	1,536.00	0.00	1,536.00
GRADER REPAIR	768.00	0.00	768.00
SKID STEER MAINTENANCE	870.00	0.00	870.00
SKID STEER REPAIR	512.00	0.00	512.00
TRUCK MAINTENANCE	256.00	0.00	256.00
TRUCK REPAIR	256.00	0.00	256.00
MOWER MAINTENANCE	512.00	135.29	376.71
MOWER REPAIR	256.00	0.00	256.00
WEED HARVESTER MAINTENANCE	256.00	0.00	256.00
WEED HARVESTER REPAIR	154.00	0.00	154.00
ANNUAL FLEET INSPECT REPORT	1,229.00	0.00	1,229.00
OTHER EQUIP\MACHIN MAINT.	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	6,605.00	135.29	6,469.71
CIVIL UTILITIES & SERVICES			
WATER-WILD ADMIN & GOV	489.00	488.83	0.17
WATER-WILD PH 1 CAP(2039)	1,340.00	669.71	670.29
WATER-WILD PH 2 CAP(PAID)	0.00	0.00	0.00
WATER-WILD PH 3 CAP(PAID)	0.00	0.00	0.00
WATER-WILD PH 4 CAP(PAID)	0.00	0.00	0.00
WATER-WILD PH 5 CAP(2026)	0.00	0.00	0.00
WATER-DISTRIBUTION (N\A)	0.00	0.00	0.00
WASTEWATER-REG ADMIN & GOV	0.00	0.00	0.00
WASTEWATER-REG SYS CAPITAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
WASTEWATER-LOCAL COLLECTION	0.00	0.00	0.00
SOLID WASTE- CONTRACT(MUNI)	512.00	0.00	512.00
SOLID WASTE- CONTRACT(COMM)	0.00	212.48	212.48-
SOLID WASTE- REG MEMBERSHIP	0.00	0.00	0.00
SOLID WASTE- COLLECTION	3,000.00	1,453.52	1,546.48
TOTAL	5,341.00	2,824.54	2,516.46

| Description | 2026 BUDGET | 2026 ACTUALS | VARIANCE |

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
MUNICIPAL PLAN & DEVELOPMENT			
DEV.OFFICER- CONTRACT	2,526.00	1,200.00	1,326.00
DEV.OFFICER-MILEAGE\EXPENSE	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEV.OFFICER-PERMIT RETENTIO	1,024.00	595.00	429.00
DEVELOPMENT ENFORCEMENT	6,000.00	3,174.70	2,825.30
PLANNING SERVICES- CONTRACT	0.00	0.00	0.00
PLANNING SERVICES- FEES	0.00	0.00	0.00
SDAB AGREEMENT	316.00	300.00	16.00
SDAB APPEAL HEARING FEES	0.00	0.00	0.00
SAFETY CODES QMP	1,053.00	1,000.00	53.00
LEGAL\CONSULTING FEES	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	10,919.00	6,269.70	4,649.30
COMMUNITY\REGIONAL INITIATIVES			
EAST END BUS	384.00	375.00	9.00
LIBRARY - YRL	379.00	378.30	0.70
MILESTONE ANNIV (MOVE)	0.00	0.00	0.00
REC EVENTS-CANADA\AIM\MUSIC	819.00	2,232.47	1,413.47-
REC EVENTS-OTHER	0.00	0.00	0.00
FCSS GRANT- PROVINCIAL CONT	2,564.00	2,564.00	0.00
FCSS GRANT- MUNICIPAL CONT	641.00	641.00	0.00
COMMUNITY DONATIONS	256.00	0.00	256.00
TOTAL	5,043.00	6,190.77	1,147.77-
ELECTION \ CENSUS			
ELECTION SERV-SALARY\CONTR	0.00	0.00	0.00
ADVERTISING	0.00	0.00	0.00
GOODS & SUPPLIES	0.00	0.00	0.00
CANDIDATE-TRAINING\ORIENT	0.00	0.00	0.00
ELECTION-OTHER	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
LOANS AND LOAN REPAYMENT			
WEED HARV LOAN (INTEREST)	3,664.00	0.00	3,664.00
WEED HARV LOAN (PRINC-LGFF)	27,236.00	0.00	27,236.00
OTHER LOANS (INTEREST)	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER LOANS (PRINCIPAL)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	30,900.00	0.00	30,900.00
SPECIAL PROJECTS OPERATING			
REGIONAL LIBRARY(OPL)	1,050.00	1,050.00	0.00
LUB #2022-4 REVIEWSURV&DR)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRAFFIC\PARKING BYLAW REV	0.00	0.00	0.00
Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
PARKING BYLAW REVIEW	0.00	0.00	0.00
FIRE BYLAW REVIEW	0.00	0.00	0.00
MILESTONE ANNIVERSARY	750.00	0.00	750.00
MR REHAB PROJ (2024 - 8&9)	0.00	0.00	0.00
MOORING PLAN DEVELOPMENT	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRIVACY MGMT PLAN	1,500.00	500.00	1,000.00
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
OHS COMPLIANCE	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00
P\W TOOL KIT\CABINET REVAMP	0.00	0.00	0.00
WEED ABATEMENT PROJECT	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00
TOTAL	9,800.00	1,550.00	8,250.00
OPERATING TRANSFER(TO CAPITAL)			
PROJECT COSTS NOT COVERED	0.00	0.00	0.00
BY GRANTS OR RESERVES			
TOTAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
RESERVE ACCOUNTS			
RESERVES-COUNCIL	2,586.00	0.00	2,586.00
RESERVES-ADMIN	2,969.00	0.00	2,969.00
RESERVES-LEGAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
RESERVES-ELECTION	0.00	0.00	0.00
RESERVES-CPO\BYLAW	1,275.00	0.00	1,275.00
RESERVES-FIRE\FIRE PROTECT	0.00	0.00	0.00
RESERVES-COMMON SERVICES	2,125.00	0.00	2,125.00
RESERVES-WATER\WASTEWATER	1,024.00	0.00	1,024.00
RESERVES-SOLID WASTE	0.00	0.00	0.00
RESERVES-MUNI PLAN\DEVELOPM	1,024.00	0.00	1,024.00
RESERVES-REC & PARKS	512.00	0.00	512.00
RESERVES-EQUIP & MACHINES	1,816.00	0.00	1,816.00
RESERVES-GENERAL AMORT	20,664.00	0.00	20,664.00
TOTAL	33,995.00	0.00	33,995.00
CAPITAL PROJECTS			
ROADS - NAKA DR WEST (0.9KM)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS - NAKA DR EAST (0.9KM)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS - KARPO,HILLCREST,LANE WAY & RR23 (1.0KM)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS - 4TH,5TH,6TH ST (0.8KM)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS - 1ST,2ND,3RD ST (UNDEV)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS - KASSIAN WAY (0.4KM)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROADS-GENERAL (DUST CONTROL)	9,737.00	0.00	9,737.00
BRIDGE - NAKA DRIVE WEST	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP - FOUNDATION	0.00	0.00	0.00
Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
SHOP - ROOF	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP - STRUCTURE & FRAMING	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP - MECHANICAL & UTILITY	0.00	0.00	0.00
SHOP - LOT AND YARD	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-SEACAN	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-BASEBALL FENCE	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-BENCHES	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-FLOWER BEDS	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-LITTLE LIBRARY	0.00	0.00	0.00
BUILD & STRUCT-PICKLEBALL CT	0.00	0.00	0.00
BOAT LAUNCH\MOORING-REHAB(RES)	0.00	0.00	0.00
BOAT LAUNCH-H20 SAFETY\CONTROL	7,000.00	3,290.98	3,709.02
SIGNS - TRAFFIC SAFETY	11,480.00	0.00	11,480.00
SIGNS - WELCOME,COMM,NOTICE BD	0.00	0.00	0.00
SIGNS - MUNICIPAL ADDRESSING	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRAINAGE - NAKA DRIVE WEST	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRAINAGE - NAKA DRIVE EAST	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRAINAGE - KARPO,HILLCREST, LANEWAY, RR23	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRAINAGE - 1ST,2ND,3RD ST(UND)	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRAINAGE - 4TH,5TH,6TH ST	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#4004	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#4006	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#4007	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#2	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#3	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#4	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#5 (RES)	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#6(TED MCDON)	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#7(PW SHOP)	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#8	0.00	0.00	0.00
GREENSPACES - MR#9	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRAILS & PATHS-NATURE(N-LK FR)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRAILS & PATHS-SOUTH(E-BCK LN)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TRAILS & PATHS-SOUTH(W-SKI TR)	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-GRADER REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-SKID STR REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-TRUCK REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-MOWER REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-WEED HARV REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-TRAILER REHAB\REPL	0.00	0.00	0.00
EQUIPMENT-SHOP EQUIP REHAB\REP	0.00	0.00	0.00
WATER SYSTEM CAPITAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
WASTEWATER SYSTEM CAPITAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE

Description	2026 BUDGET	2026 ACTUALS	VARIANCE
OTHER CIVIL UTILITY CAPITAL	0.00	0.00	0.00
LSAC CAPITAL CONTRIBUTE (LGFF)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS	28,217.00	3,290.98	24,926.02
TOTAL EXPENSES	352,281.00	181,060.73	171,220.27

S.V. of Nakamun Park
Bank Reconciliation Summary
As at September 30, 2026

ATB - BUSINESS ACCOUNT

Statement Balance:	$	331,833.43	
Plus Deposits in Transit:		10,370.44	(September TPP)
Less Outstanding Cheques:		-	
Plus/Less Miscellaneous Items:		-	
= Balance per G/L:		342,203.87	
Actual G/L Balance:		342,203.87	
Difference:		-	

ATB - MUSH SAVINGS ACCOUNT (TAX SALE FUNDS IN TRUST - 4008)

Statement Balance:	$	77,552.28
Plus Deposits in Transit:		-
Less Outstanding Cheques:		-
Plus/Less Miscellaneous Items:		-
= Balance per G/L:		77,552.28
Actual G/L Balance:		77,552.28
Difference:	$	-

ATB - BUSINESS TERM LOAN (WEED HARVESTER)

Loan Balance:	$	76,028.57
Accrued Interest:	$	2,859.41

Open Items: CASH - ATB NP 000 00,00

Name	A121B	Reconcile R	
Description	CASH - ATB NP	Date	Sep 30,26
Normal Bal	D	Balance	331,833.43
Next Ref#	0	Closing Bal	339,857.46
# of Items	4	Opening Bal	331,833.43

Date	Ref	Description	Amount	Balance
Sep 30,26		TPP- SEPTEMBER	10,370.44	342,203.87

Open Items: CASH - ATB TAX SALE 4008 000 00,00

Date	Ref	Description	Amount	Balance
Name	A121D		Reconcile R	
Description	CASH - ATB TAX SALE 4008		Date	Sep 30,26
Normal Bal	D		Balance	77,552.28
Next Ref#	0		Closing Bal	77,552.28
# of Items	0		Opening Bal	77,552.28

Open Items: LOAN ACCOUNT (4900)(125K) 000 00,00

Date	Ref	Description	Amount	Balance
Name	L273		Reconcile R	
Description	LOAN ACCOUNT (4900)(125K)		Date	May 31,25
Normal Bal	C		Balance	76,028.57
Next Ref#	0		Closing Bal	76,028.57
# of Items	0		Opening Bal	76,028.57

ATB Financial™

SAVING I BORROWING I INVESTING I KNOW-HOW

Consolidated Statement

Statement date September 30, 2026
Transit number [redacted]
Customer number [redacted]
Cheque images 1

[redacted]
Summer Village of Nakamun Park
PO Box 1250
Onoway AB T0E 1V0

Your ATB Financial Branch
08989 Onoway Branch
4910 50 St
Onoway AB
T0E 1V0

If you have any questions, contact us at 1 800 332-8383 or visit us at www.atb.com

[redacted]

A summary of your accounts on Sep 30, 2026

Deposits	Value on Sep 30, 2026
	CAD
Business Public Sector Account [redacted]	331,833.43
Business Public Sector Savings [redacted]	77,552.28
Total Deposits	**$409,385.71**

Loans	Value on Sep 30, 2026
	CAD
Independent Business Loan - Revolving [redacted] Credit limit $150,000.00	0.00
Business Term Loan [redacted]	76,028.57
Total Loans	**$76,028.57**

All loan balances, with the exception of mortgage loans, do NOT include accrued interest. The above should not be relied upon for repayment purposes. Please contact your branch for a payout statement.

Find an error? Give us a call or drop by a branch. We'll take care of it.

Keep your credentials private. Never share your banking login details, passwords, or 2FA code with anyone. ATB will never ask you for these.

™ Trademarks of Alberta Treasury Branches.

BALANCE SHEET -NAKAMUN	Beg:000 00,00 End:Sep 30,26		Type: A
ASSETS			
CASH ON HAND:			
CASH - RBC BANK	0.00		
CASH - ATB NP	342,203.87		
CASH - ATB TAX SALE 4008	77,552.28		
CASH - (SAVINGS- RBC)	0.00		
CASH - (SAVINGS- RBC)	0.00		
INVESTED CASH - TERM DEPOSIT	0.00		
BANK - OFF-SET (GRANT CASH)	0.00		
BANK - RESTRICTED CASH	0.00		
PREPAID EXPENSES	0.00		
PETTY CASH	0.00		
TOTAL CASH		419,756.15	
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE:			
TAXES & GRANTS-IN-LIEU REC	46,075.10		
RECEIVABLE FROM OTHER GOVT'S:			
GOV'T GRANTS RECEIVABLE	0.00		
TRADE ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	0.00		
FEDERAL GST - 132003690	1,799.30		
ALL OTHER RECEIVABLES	50.00		
DEPOSITS	0.00		
TOTAL ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE		47,924.40	
REQUISITION UNDER\OVER LEVY	0.00		
FIXED ASSETS:			
ENGINEERING STRUCTURES	487,660.21		
ACCUM.AMORT.-ENG. STRUCT.	61,691.64-		
BUILDINGS	313,207.09		
ACCUM.AMORT.-BUILDINGS	23,768.69-		
MACHINERY & EQUIPMENT	359,032.45		
ACCUM.AMORT.-MACH.&EQUIP.	99,706.74-		
VEHICLES	19,492.24		
ACCUM.AMORT- VEHICLES	19,492.24-		
LAND IMPROVEMENTS	172,505.65		
ACCUM.AMORT-LAND IMPROV.	27,486.03-		
LAND	332,957.48		
WORK IN PROGRESS	0.00		
TOTAL FIXED ASSETS		1,452,709.78	
TOTAL ASSETS			1,920,390.33
LIABILITIES			
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE (AUDITOR)	4,350.00		
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE (MISC)	1,013.03		
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE (VISA)	0.00		
LOAN ACCOUNT (4900)(125K)	76,028.57		

Description	Beg:000 00,00 End:Sep 30,26		Type: A

BALANCE SHEET -NAKAMUN	Beg:000 00,00	End:Sep 30,26	Type: A
DEPOSITS:(TAXSALE 5054)	853.54		
DEPOSITS:(TAXSALE 4008)	77,552.28		
TOTAL ACCOUNTS PAYABLE		159,797.42	
DEFERRED REVENUE	0.00		
RESERVES - OPERATING:			
RESERVES- UNRESTRICTED	0.00		
RESERVES- COUNCIL	4,109.00		
RESERVES- ADMIN	4,485.00		
RESERVES- LEGAL	1,585.00		
RESERVES- ELECTION	323.08-		
RESERVES- CPO\BYLAWS	2,830.00		
RESERVES- FIRE SERVICES	3,120.00		
RESERVES- COMMON SERVICES	2,474.27		
RESERVES- WATER\WASTEWATER	1,000.00		
RESERVES- WASTE SERVICES	0.00		
RESERVES- EQUIPMENT\MACHINES	1,774.00		
RESERVES- MUNI PLAN\ENFORCE	4,120.00		
RESERVES- RECREATION & PARKS	3,620.00		
RESERVES- MSI OPERATING	4,000.00		
RESERVES - CAPITAL:			
RESERVES- INFRAST REFURB.	18,200.00		
RESERVES- EQUIP & MACHINES	27,508.00		
RESERVES- ROAD	1,500.00		
RESERVES- LGFF WEED HARV LN	56,941.14		
RESERVES- GEN.AMORT\TCA	38,369.00		
TOTAL RESERVES		175,312.33	
TOTAL EQUITY IN FIXED ASSETS		858,953.76	
L902 UNRESTRICTED SURPLUS	0.00		
L900 ACCUMULATED SURPLUS	360,578.71-		
*TO MATCH AUDIT ACCUM SURP:			
*REMOVE NV L902 BALANCE			
SURPLUS FROM PRIOR	1,037,708.36		
TCA ADDITIONS	102,473.31		
TCA DISPOSALS	0.00		
TCA AMORTIZATION	53,276.14-		
TOTAL SURPLUS		726,326.82	
TOTAL LIABILITIES			1,920,390.33
PROOF			0.00
PRESENTED TO COUNCIL THIS ____ DAY OF _____ , 2026			

Description	Beg:000 00,00	End:Sep 30,26	Type: A

SUMMER VILLAGE OF NAKAMUN PARK

SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD

NOTICE OF DECISION

Hearing date: September 23, 2026

Written decision date: October 6, 2026

Appeal file: 26SDAB01-23

Development permit application: 26DP01-23

Appellant: [redacted]

Development Authority: Summer Village of Nakamun Park Municipal Planning Commission

Subject lands: Plan 187 MC, Block 12, Lot 3A

Municipal address: 5607 Nakamun Drive, Summer Village of Nakamun Park, Alberta

INTRODUCTION AND DECISION

[1] This appeal concerns the refusal of an application to retain an existing fence with a variance to the maximum front-yard fence height. [redacted] (the Appellant) appeals the Municipal Planning Commission's refusal of Development Permit Application No. 26DP01-23 for the above-noted lands (the Lands).

[2] The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (the Board) dismisses the appeal and confirms the refusal. The Board declines to grant the requested height variance under section 687(3)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26 (the MGA). No development permit is issued for the as-built over-height fence.

[3] The Board has independently considered the application, the evidence and the statutory variance test. Its decision does not rest on the Development Authority's unnecessary-hardship test, a numerical limit on the Board's variance power, or an assumption that non-compliance itself establishes harm.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Board and appearances

[4] The hearing was held on September 23, 2026, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the Summer Village of Nakamun Park Administration Office, 2317 Township Road 545, Lac Ste. Anne County, Alberta. Jamie Kraley chaired the panel, with John Roznicki and Anthony Siegel as members. Emily House acted as Clerk.

[5] [redacted] attended with his representative, Craig Thomas, who identified himself as a professional planner. Tony Sonnleitner appeared as the Development Officer for the Summer Village. After confirmation that the panel members were not residents or ratepayers of Nakamun Park, no objection was made to the panel.

Jurisdiction and procedure

[6] The application was submitted on March 17, 2026. The Municipal Planning Commission considered and refused it on April 21, 2026. The Notice of Decision is dated August 5, 2026. The Board received the Appellant's Notice of Appeal on August 25, 2026. The Development Officer's written and oral submissions referred to August 1 as the notification date and explained that a clerical error delayed communication of the correct decision. He confirmed that the appeal had been accepted as valid. No party challenged its timeliness. On the written Notice of Decision and the evidence presented, the Board accepts the appeal as timely and within its jurisdiction under sections 685 and 686 of the MGA.

[7] The hearing was convened within 30 days after receipt of the appeal. The Clerk confirmed that at least five days' notice had been given to the Appellant, the Development Authority, adjacent and affected landowners, and Board members. No notice objection or other preliminary issue was raised.

[8] The Chair explained the hearing procedure. The parties were given opportunities to present their cases, ask questions and respond. The Development Officer and the Appellant's representative made closing submissions, with the Appellant's representative speaking last. Mr. Thomas confirmed that he felt heard. The public portion of the hearing then concluded.

[9] The Board considered the written appeal record, oral presentations, photographs, site information, bylaw excerpts and authorities presented at the hearing. Appendix A identifies the exhibits. The summary below records the material written and oral submissions, questions, responses and closing submissions. Submissions are attributed to the party making them and are distinguished from the Board's findings of fact.

ISSUES

[10] The issues are the applicable fence-height requirement; the nature and extent of the requested variance; the Board's authority under section 687(3)(d); and whether the evidence concerning this fence, in its actual setting, supports approval despite non-compliance with the Land Use Bylaw.

APPLICABLE LEGISLATION AND PLANNING FRAMEWORK

[11] Section 687(3)(a.3) of the MGA requires the Board to comply with the land use bylaw, subject to section 687(3)(d). Section 687(3)(c) permits the Board to confirm, revoke or vary the decision appealed from, or substitute its own decision. Applicable statutory plans must also be respected.

[12] Section 687(3)(d) permits the Board to make an order or decision or issue or confirm a development permit despite non-compliance with the land use bylaw if, in its opinion, (i) the proposed development would not (A) unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, or (B) materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land, and (ii) the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for that land or building in the land use bylaw. The negative-effects condition requires the absence of both prohibited forms of interference. Satisfaction of the prescribed-use requirement, or the absence of material neighbouring-parcel interference, does not dispense with the neighbourhood-amenity requirement.

[13] The Lands are within the R1 - Residential - Standard Lot District under Summer Village of Nakamun Park Land Use Bylaw 2025-5 (the LUB). The application concerns fencing associated with residential use. No change of use is proposed, and the Board finds no issue with conformity to the prescribed use. The dispute concerns fence height and its effects.

[14] Section 31(a)(1) of the LUB establishes a maximum fence height of 1.83 metres for a portion that does not extend forward beyond the foremost portion of the principal building. Section 31(a)(2) establishes a maximum of 0.91 metres for a portion extending into the front yard beyond that building line. Section 31(b) requires an approved development permit for fence construction, subject to the exemptions in section 12.

[15] The LUB defines the front yard of a lakefront lot by reference to the water and that of a back lot by reference to the legal road allowance. The road-facing yard of a lakefront parcel may therefore be a rear yard, whereas the disputed frontage of these Lands is a front yard. Section 33(b) also restricts detached garages and accessory buildings from being closer to the front yard than the closest portion of the principal building. Section 33(i) provides a specific exception for qualifying boathouses on lakefront lots; other accessory buildings remain subject to section 33(b). These provisions provide planning context for the distinction between front and rear residential space. They do not establish that any particular comparator fence screens an accessory building.

[16] Section 16(b) of the LUB limits the Development Authority's variance powers through provisions concerning unnecessary hardship or practical difficulties. It also limits a Development Officer's quantitative variances to 20%,

with larger requests referred to the Municipal Planning Commission. Those restrictions do not replace the Board's statutory test under section 687(3)(d).

[17] In Tymchak v Edmonton (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board), 2012 ABCA 22 at paragraphs 19-21, the Court distinguished a development officer's bylaw-based hardship test from the Board's statutory variance test. At paragraphs 24-26, the Court explained that a variance need not have no effect whatever and confirmed the relevance of neighbourhood photographs. The Board must assess the degree of an effect in its actual context, rather than equate any visible change with undue interference.

[18] Newcastle Centre GP Ltd v Edmonton (City), 2014 ABCA 295 at paragraphs 6-12 rejects a presumption of harm arising simply from a bylaw restriction and requires the Board to explain the interference on which it relies. The statutory variance power is broad and is not confined to hardship, unique circumstances or minor departures. The Board must explain its decision by reference to the statutory planning criteria. Construction error or an owner's conduct cannot substitute for that analysis.

SUMMARY OF THE HEARING

Opening statements and the appeal record

[19] At the outset, the Chair called the hearing to order and the agenda was adopted. The panel members and Clerk introduced themselves. Mr. Thomas asked whether any panel member was a resident or ratepayer of Nakamun Park; after the Clerk confirmed that none was, he raised no objection. The Clerk identified the refusal, Lands, appeal date, notice requirements and requirement for a written decision with reasons within 15 days after the hearing concluded.

[20] The Clerk read Exhibits 1-6 into the record. No objection was made to those exhibits. Mr. Thomas explained that the Appellant had retained him only a few days before the hearing because of a family medical circumstance. He advised that he would provide additional materials supporting his oral presentation. [redacted] identified 5607 Nakamun Drive as his cabin and recreational property. Mr. Thomas identified himself as a professional planner with approximately 35 years of planning experience.

[21] The Chair explained that the Board would decide the appeal on planning merits, evidence and the applicable planning legislation and documents. He outlined the order of presentations, opportunities for questions and responses, and closing submissions, with the Appellant having the last word. He asked participants to provide copies of written statements and documents referred to. No procedural objection or preliminary issue was raised.

Development Officer presentation

[22] Mr. Sonnleitner identified the matter as an appeal from the Municipal Planning Commission's refusal of an as-built fence permit. His written submission described the fence as approximately 2.00 metres high against a 0.91-metre limit and characterized the proposed variance as over 200% of the prescribed height. It stated that earlier Bylaws 2022-4 and 2007-03 had the same maximum-height requirements and that no permit had previously been applied for or granted. Orally, he explained that he photographed the fence in winter using a board marked in one-foot increments, obtaining approximately six and one-half feet. He acknowledged the uneven ground and measurements closer to 1.83 metres at some locations. He did not maintain that every part measured a full two metres.

[23] The Development Officer said the application was received on March 17, 2026. Because the necessary variance exceeded his 20% authority, he referred it to the Municipal Planning Commission, which refused it. Both his written submission and oral presentation referred to notification on August 1 following a clerical error. He said the appeal was accepted as valid. The formal written Notice of Decision in the record is dated August 5, 2026.

[24] He explained that the 2025 LUB sets a front-yard fence limit of 0.91 metres, approximately three feet, and a rear-yard limit of 1.83 metres, approximately six feet. On lakefront lots the lake-facing side is the front, and the road-

facing side is the rear. On non-lakefront lots such as the Appellant's, the front faces Nakamun Drive, the dwelling is set back from that road, and the rear yard is to the south.

[25] He submitted that approximately 35 to 40 lots along that side of the road were in a similar situation, generally with no front fence or a fence at approximately the lower height limit. He described this property as an exception. He explained that the Development Authority's variance provisions required unnecessary hardship or practical difficulties particular to the land's use, character or situation and not generally common to other land in the district. In his view, no such distinction existed here, so the requested variance did not meet the Development Authority's test.

[26] After the opening Development Officer presentation, the Chair invited questions. None was pursued at that stage.

Appellant presentation on the legal test and construction history

[27] The Appellant's written Notice of Appeal stated that the variance was reasonable and that the fence did not unduly interfere with community or street character or with neighbours' use and enjoyment. His March 17, 2026 letter requested retention of the six-foot/1.83-metre fence, described it as an improvement defining public and private space, and identified security and an effective physical barrier as reasons for the additional height. It stated that a 0.9-metre fence would not reasonably achieve that purpose. At the hearing, Mr. Thomas referred to Exhibit 5 and submitted that the Board should exercise its own authority under section 687(3)(d). He identified undue interference with neighbourhood amenities and material interference with neighbouring parcels' use, enjoyment or value as the impact questions, and submitted that the evidence established neither.

[28] He explained that [redacted] hired a contractor in 2023 and relied on the contractor to address construction and permitting. He referred to section 31(a)(2) of former LUB 2022-4 and its parenthetical note: (Note: Current Bylaw is 1.83m front or back I think). He said the note appeared in the adopted bylaw and conflicted with the accompanying 0.91-metre limit. He offered that inconsistency as context for the Appellant's belief that the fence was allowed.

[29] Mr. Thomas acknowledged that, as a planner, he read the operative provision as requiring a three-foot front-yard fence and understood that a permit was required. He submitted that a lay reader could nevertheless be confused by the drafting and that the Appellant had not intended to act improperly.

[30] He distinguished the Municipal Planning Commission's unnecessary-hardship and practical-difficulty test from the Board's MGA test. In his submission, the LUB placed a threshold on the Development Authority's ability to vary its requirements, whereas the Board exercised a separate statutory authority. He described Tymchak as an example in which the Board could grant relief even though the Development Officer was constrained by a narrower bylaw test. His position was that the Municipal Planning Commission's inability to find hardship did not determine the appeal.

Appellant presentation on measurements and the extent of the variance

[31] Mr. Thomas said the fence was constructed from six-foot boards and was intended to be six feet high. The trim was flush at the top and bottom and the top was consistently level. The ground beneath it rose and fell. He submitted that the LUB's grade definition called for averaging where the ground was uneven, rather than treating one low point as representative of the entire fence.

[32] He referred to measurements ranging from approximately 1.78 to 1.90 metres, with an average of approximately 1.85 metres. He suggested that the Board could consider a grade adjustment if it considered that necessary, but submitted that a small difference around six feet would not materially change the planning issue.

[33] He challenged the description of a 200% variance. A six-foot fence is approximately twice a three-foot standard, representing an increase of approximately 100%; a 200% increase would produce approximately nine feet. He also submitted that section 687(3)(d) places no numerical percentage limit on the Board's variance power and requires consideration of actual planning impacts.

Appellant presentation on neighbourhood character and appearance

[34] Mr. Thomas compared the Spring Lake and Nakamun Park photographs in section 7 of the supporting materials. He said the Spring Lake image showed a paved road, visible dwellings framing the street, open landscaped front yards, consistency and a sense that the area between the dwellings and road formed part of a semi-public streetscape. The Nakamun Park image showed a gravel road, screened buildings, informal edges, vegetation and fencing, and no consistent pattern of architecture, setbacks, landscaping or presentation to the road.

[35] He emphasized that the comparison did not mean Nakamun Park had less character. Its character was different: informal, naturalized, varied and recreation-focused, with roadside yards appearing predominantly private. A six-foot fence might be out of character in the Spring Lake image, he submitted, while making no difference in the Nakamun Park setting. He said amenity must be assessed in the context of the actual neighbourhood.

[36] Referring to sections 5 and 6 of the supporting materials, he described different fence heights, setbacks, screening and relationships between properties and the road. He stated that Nakamun Park was recreation-focused in its Municipal Development Plan and provincial categorization. He submitted that, if Council intended a more formal or cohesive streetscape, that direction would appear in the Municipal Development Plan, and that it did not.

[37] Mr. Thomas said that he and [redacted] had walked the entire community a few days before the hearing. Of 151 dwellings, only 28 properties, approximately 18%, had roadside yards without enclosure; approximately 82% had some enclosure. His description included fences and natural vegetation and included lakefront properties as well as non-lakefront properties. He offered those observations as evidence that enclosure was a predominant existing feature, not an exceptional intrusion.

[38] He said his visit was his first to Nakamun Park and that he had inspected the community before forming his view. Referring to the subject-property photographs in section 3, he described the lawn and purposeful landscaping as exceptionally well maintained and the fence as straight, consistently and professionally constructed, and in good condition. He said it was neither makeshift nor deteriorated, introduced no visual disorder and contributed positively to the property and streetscape.

[39] Mr. Thomas emphasized that the LUB permits approximately six-foot fences in road-facing rear yards on lakefront lots. Nakamun Drive runs along the lake with lakefront and non-lakefront properties facing the same roadway. In his submission, the legal yard classification changes across the road but the physical streetscape does not. The ability to build comparable-height fencing on the lakefront side was therefore important to assessing the actual effect of the Appellant's fence.

Appellant response to the written opposition and security concerns

[40] Mr. Thomas addressed [redacted]s opposition to high road-facing fences on non-lakefront lots. He disputed the letter's description of a typical urban street view, openness and cohesiveness. He submitted that the photographs showed an informal recreational community rather than Edmonton or Spring Lake, and that the Municipal Development Plan did not establish the urban character described in the letter.

[41] He also challenged a general objection to six-foot fences along the road when the LUB allows that height on road-facing lakefront rear yards. If openness along the entire road were the controlling objective, he submitted, the same three-foot limit would apply on both sides. The question remained what this fence did in its actual location.

[42] Mr. Thomas identified himself as certified in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. He characterized the letter's 'eyes on the street' concern as a natural-surveillance principle whose effectiveness varies with density and consistent occupancy. In a more dispersed recreational community with homes vacant for periods, he said openness could instead expose unoccupied dwellings to people seeking opportunities for break-ins. His written presentation notes also referred generally to studies supporting that position.

[43] He cited 2021 census data as indicating that approximately 74% of Nakamun Park properties were not principal residences. He suggested that seasonal occupancy helped explain the existing predominance of private, enclosed

roadside yards. He submitted that the fence should be assessed in that setting rather than by assuming that greater visibility always improves security.

Appellant presentation on the authorities and neighbouring parcels

[44] Relying on Newcastle, Mr. Thomas submitted that non-compliance with a bylaw does not create a presumption of harm. He said the Board must identify the amenity or neighbouring parcel affected, explain the actual interference and determine whether it reaches the statutory degree. He also relied on Tymchak for the distinction between some effect and undue interference.

[45] On neighbouring parcels, he asked which property's use was impeded, whose enjoyment was materially affected and what evidence showed diminished value. He submitted that there was no evidence of any of those effects. He referred to the supporting letter from the owner identified as being at 5604 Nakamun Drive, describing that owner as the most affected neighbour, and submitted that the support was important evidence favouring approval.

Appellant presentation on the municipal survey and requested disposition

[46] Mr. Thomas referred to a survey conducted before adoption of the current LUB. He said Question 14 asked respondents to rate six enforcement matters individually on a scale from 1, most important, to 6, least important, including fence-height and material compliance. He characterized approximately 80% of responses as treating fence compliance as unimportant, with nearly half assigning it the lowest rating of 6.

[47] He contrasted that result with the importance respondents placed on property aesthetics and maintenance. In his submission, the appearance of this well-maintained property was consistent with those priorities. He argued that the Municipal Planning Commission had identified neither a particular amenity unduly affected nor a neighbouring parcel materially affected.

[48] Concluding his main presentation, he relied on the informal streetscape, sound fence construction, neighbour support, survey responses and allowance for comparable-height road-facing fencing on lakefront lots. He submitted that neither prohibited form of interference was established and asked the Board to allow the appeal and approve the existing fence. The Chair invited questions; no substantive question was pursued at that point.

Other submissions

[49] When the Chair invited other presentations and asked about further submissions, no additional oral presentation was made for or against the appeal. The Clerk identified the opposition submission already included as Exhibit 6 and confirmed there were no further submissions to introduce at that stage. The supporting neighbour letter was already part of the Appellant's written record.

[50] [redacted]s written submission, made on behalf of himself and his wife and addressed by Mr. Thomas orally, opposed high road-facing fences on non-lakefront lots on grounds of bylaw consistency, neighbourhood appearance, a closed-in feeling, openness and natural surveillance. [redacted] did not make an oral presentation.

Development Officer closing submissions

[51] In closing, Mr. Sonnleitner addressed section 687(3)(d) and asked whether this taller fence affected the streetscape. He acknowledged that, for a single fence, there might not be an impact. He then argued that the municipality had consistently sought openness on the non-lakefront side and that allowing six-foot fencing throughout Nakamun Drive and elsewhere would materially change community character.

[52] He described the subject frontage as an outlier in an otherwise open area and referred to Council's role as elected representatives in determining community standards. He argued that allowing the pattern to change would close in the road and undermine the outcome sought by the bylaw. He characterized that change as the relevant harm.

[53] He referred to other fences shown in the Appellant's photographs and said the municipality was working to remediate two of them. He also referred to a nearby owner who had brought a property into compliance, and later to two or three adjacent properties being brought into compliance. He acknowledged that enforcement costs presented a challenge, but submitted that the current Council had made consistent efforts to enforce the lower front-yard standard.

[54] He responded to the note in the former bylaw by describing it as an apparent error in a version placed on the website. He said the successive bylaws had consistently intended three-foot front-yard and six-foot rear-yard fencing, with the lake as the front of lakefront lots.

[55] He also referred to planning efforts to make communities more liveable by bringing dwellings closer to the street and reducing fencing. He gave an example of setbacks moving from approximately 25 feet to 17 feet and referred to Spring Lake's reduced setback. He submitted that the Board should distinguish having power to grant a variance from deciding whether to exercise it, and contrasted small 5% or 10% departures with the approximately 100% increase sought here.

[56] He asked the Board to uphold the Municipal Planning Commission's refusal, submitting that the requested variance would materially harm community character. His closing position relied substantially on consistency and the effect of taller fencing becoming a wider pattern.

Board question and response

[57] A Board member asked the Development Officer to confirm the treatment of front and rear yards on lakefront lots, noting that some municipalities require lower fencing on both sides. Mr. Sonnleitner confirmed that, in Nakamun Park, the lake-facing front yard has the lower allowance and the road-facing rear yard may have approximately six-foot fencing. He referred to Spring Lake as having a similar orientation rule.

Appellant reply

[58] Mr. Thomas objected that the Development Officer had gone beyond explaining the Municipal Planning Commission's decision. He referred to Springfield Capital, describing it as restricting a development authority from adding to its decision through later advocacy or "bootstrapping." He characterized statements about Council's intentions as hearsay and argued that the original refusal concerned hardship rather than findings under the Board's impact test.

[59] He distinguished statutory plans from a land use bylaw. In his submission, a statutory plan describes future policy and vision, while the LUB contains current development regulations. He disputed the Development Officer's description of the LUB as the community's visionary document and repeated that the Municipal Development Plan did not require the formal urban frontage being advanced in opposition. He accepted that the Board must comply with applicable statutory plans.

[60] He disputed the characterization of the property as an outlier, repeating the approximately 82% enclosure figure. He clarified that his references to roadside yards included lakefront properties and that enclosure could consist of natural trees and bushes as well as fences. He said many roadside fences exceeded three feet and that the photographs showed the community's actual character.

[61] Mr. Thomas also repeated the seasonal-occupancy figure in response to the Development Officer's liveability argument. He submitted that recreational communities develop organically, and that planning may either seek change through policy and regulation or recognize the character that has developed. He maintained that this well-maintained fence did not detract from Nakamun Park's existing character and that an idealized different streetscape should not determine the appeal.

[62] He concluded that the percentage variance was not decisive because section 687(3)(d) contains no percentage cap. In his submission, the contextual statutory test supported approval. He provided his presentation notes, the survey and Newcastle to the Clerk. The survey was identified as Exhibit 7 and Newcastle and Tymchak as Exhibit 8.

Conclusion of the public hearing

[63] The Chair asked whether the parties felt heard. Mr. Thomas confirmed that he did. The public hearing concluded following a motion and affirmative vote. The Clerk confirmed in response to Mr. Thomas that written reasons would be provided within 15 days. The Board's subsequent deliberations are not part of this summary of evidence and submissions made by the parties.

FINDINGS OF FACT

[64] The Lands are a non-lakefront residential parcel at 5607 Nakamun Drive, legally described as Plan 187 MC, Block 12, Lot 3A. Their front yard faces Nakamun Drive. The site plan shows the disputed fence extending across the road-facing frontage and along a side boundary. The portions forward of the foremost part of the principal building are subject to the 0.91-metre maximum.

[65] The fence was constructed in approximately 2023. No development permit authorizing its construction at the disputed height was produced. The present proceeding is an appeal from refusal of an as-built development permit application, not an appeal from a stop order.

[66] For this appeal, the Board assesses the fence on the Appellant's approximately six-foot description and approximately 1.85-metre average-height evidence. It is unnecessary to resolve the precise highest measurement because the fence requires a substantial front-yard variance even on that evidence. At 1.85 metres, the excess above 0.91 metres is approximately 0.94 metres, or 103%. The Board does not adopt the refusal notice's characterization of a variance exceeding 200%.

[67] The photographs show a straight, well-maintained wooden fence composed of solid panels, with established vegetation and a maintained yard. The Board accepts that the property is cared for and that the fence is not makeshift or deteriorated. Along the road-facing boundary, the panels create a substantially continuous opaque screen beneath and between the trees, apart from access and other openings.

[68] Nakamun Park has a varied recreational streetscape. The photographic record includes substantial vegetation, different types of fencing, open areas and differing relationships between buildings and the road. Some photographs expressly identify non-lakefront comparators. The Board does not find that every other property has an open frontage or that every tall fence shown is on a lakefront lot.

[69] The supporting neighbour letter is evidence in favour of the fence. The record does not establish a measurable loss of property value, a specific obstruction of a neighbouring use, or a demonstrated safety incident attributable to this fence. General concerns about surveillance or future occupants do not establish those effects.

REASONS

[70] The affected neighbourhood amenity is the appearance of the residential streetscape along Nakamun Drive immediately beside the subject property: the landscaped front-yard setting visible beneath and between the established trees. This is an amenity experienced from the public road, rather than a claimed right to an unobstructed view into private property. The Board refuses the variance because the fence's additional solid height substantially conceals that setting over long sections and creates undue visual enclosure at this frontage.

[71] Section 687(3)(d) gives the Board broad discretion to approve a development despite non-compliance with the Land Use Bylaw, where its statutory conditions are satisfied. There is no percentage limit on that authority and no separate requirement to establish hardship, necessity or unique circumstances. The Board must assess whether the development would unduly interfere with neighbourhood amenities or materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels. Some effect is insufficient: the interference must reach the statutory threshold. These principles are consistent with Tymchak v Edmonton (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board), 2012 ABCA 22 at paragraphs 19-21 and 24-26. The Board applies that test independently of the Municipal Planning Commission's hardship analysis.

[72] Figures 5 and 9 show long sections of closely fitted wooden panels facing Nakamun Drive, forming a substantially continuous opaque barrier beneath and between the established trees. Figures 6-8 show the maintained lawn and landscaped yard behind that barrier. Trees and parts of buildings remain visible above or beyond the panels, and access and other openings remain. Along the solid sections, the panels block views from the road into the landscaped front yard. Figure 5 includes a partial view across the road, but the record does not establish the complete opposing frontage. The Board makes no finding of enclosure caused by fences on both sides of the road.

[73] A lawful 0.91-metre fence would screen the lowest part of the yard. The Board accepts that permitted screening. At the approximately 1.85-metre height assessed in this appeal, a further 0.94 metres of closely fitted solid panels blocks views above the lawful lower-fence height over the long sections shown in Figures 5 and 9. The actual interference is the replacement of those views of the landscaped frontage with a substantially continuous opaque wooden screen beneath and between the trees. The access and other openings retain limited views but do not interrupt the screening along the solid sections. This finding concerns the fence's height, opacity and extent together, not height alone.

[74] The Board finds that this interference reaches the statutory degree of undue interference. The additional screening is substantial in both height and extent: it conceals the front-yard setting above a lawful lower fence along the long solid sections, rather than causing a limited obstruction at an isolated point. Viewed from the road, those sections create a pronounced enclosing barrier across the landscaped frontage. The trees, roadside ditch, setback and remaining openings shown in Figures 5 and 9 do not remove that effect; the opaque panels fill the spaces beneath and between the trees, and the openings leave the long screened sections intact. The Board has assessed that degree of enclosure within Nakamun Park's varied recreational streetscape, including its other screened properties. It does not require uniform openness or regard every loss of a view as undue. Its conclusion rests on the substantial, continuous screening caused by the additional solid height at this particular frontage.

[75] The Board has considered all the neighbourhood photographs, including the examples labelled lakeside in Figures 16 and 17 and non-lakefront in Figures 19 and 20. Other photographs do not identify whether the property is lakefront or whether the fence encloses a front or rear yard. Even a non-lakefront label does not, by itself, establish the photographed fence's position relative to the principal building. The Board therefore does not classify every tall road-facing fence as a rear-yard fence. The photographs remain relevant evidence of neighbourhood character, but the unlabelled examples have limited weight as direct comparisons of front-yard enclosure. The Board accepts that substantial roadside screening exists. The approximately 82% enclosure count supports that context, but combines vegetation and different fence forms rather than establishing equivalent degrees of screening.

[76] The photographs also show differing degrees of opacity. The rail fencing in Figure 11 and chain-link fencing in Figure 15 permit views through the fence itself, although vegetation provides additional screening. Figures 19 and 20 show horizontal-board fencing with visible gaps; those gaps provide some visual permeability, without making the yards wholly open. Figures 16 and 17 show substantial solid screening. The Board does not treat all these boundaries as equivalent or claim that every comparator is more open than the subject fence. It also accepts that the bylaw permits approximately six-foot fences in road-facing rear yards on lakefront lots. That allowance confirms that height alone is insufficient to establish undue interference. The relevant comparison is the combined effect of height, opacity, continuity and yard setting. Figures 5 and 9 establish those features at the subject front yard; the other photographs do not establish that the same combination occurs in an equivalent front-yard setting.

[77] The Board has considered the Appellant's privacy and security reasons, seasonal occupancy, and the fence's workmanship and maintenance. Figures 7-9 show a small lower chain-link section adjoining the wooden fence, while the photographic record does not establish a gate closing the driveway. Although the lower section is short, its lower height leaves a potential point of access; the driveway is not shown to be secured. These features limit the weight the Board gives to the additional wooden-fence height as a barrier to entry. They do not establish that the taller panels provide no screening or deterrent benefit. The Board has considered those benefits, but they do not alter its finding about the degree of amenity interference caused by the additional solid screening. Good workmanship and maintenance do not reduce that visual effect. The Board does not require proof of hardship or necessity.

[78] The Board has separately considered interference with neighbouring parcels. The supporting neighbour letter and the absence of demonstrated property-value loss have been taken into account. The evidence does not establish material interference with or an effect on the use, enjoyment or value of an identified neighbouring parcel. Refusal therefore does not rest on section 687(3)(d)(i)(B). The fence also conforms with the prescribed residential use. Those findings do not resolve the separate neighbourhood-amenity condition in section 687(3)(d)(i)(A): the streetscape effect identified in paragraphs 70 and 72-74 remains even where an adjacent owner supports the fence. The survey concerns enforcement priorities and does not measure the degree of screening caused by this fence.

[79] The Board accepts Mr. Thomas's description of a varied, substantially enclosed recreational community, but disagrees that enclosure elsewhere establishes that this fence has no undue effect. Permeable fences retain views through the boundary; the subject panels close those views over long sections above the lawful lower-fence height. Other solid fences demonstrate that opaque screening exists, but do not negate the subject fence's effect identified in paragraphs 72-74. The Board gives greater weight to the direct subject-property views in assessing that effect. Its finding rests on the demonstrated degree of enclosure at this frontage, not on missing labels, presumed illegality of other fences, or predictions about future development.

[80] As Newcastle Centre GP Ltd v Edmonton (City), 2014 ABCA 295 at paragraphs 6-12 requires, the Board identifies the actual interference rather than presuming it from the bylaw restriction. The percentage departure describes the application; it is not proof of harm or a limit on the Board's discretion. Contractor reliance and the disputed bylaw note explain the construction history. Refusal is not punishment for construction without a permit. The Board assesses the Appellant's approximately 1.85-metre average height; small grade adjustments would not alter the solid screening on which its finding rests.

[81] The Board has identified the affected amenity as the residential streetscape along Nakamun Drive at the subject frontage, the actual interference as the substantial concealment of its landscaped front-yard setting by the additional solid screening, and the degree of that interference as undue for the reasons in paragraphs 72-79. It has not found material interference with an identified neighbouring parcel. On its amenity finding, the Board cannot be satisfied that the condition in section 687(3)(d)(i)(A) is met. Its broad variance discretion does not authorize approval where that statutory condition is not satisfied. The Board accordingly refuses the variance and confirms the refusal of the application.

ORDER OF THE BOARD

[82] Pursuant to section 687(3)(c) of the MGA, the appeal is dismissed and the Municipal Planning Commission's refusal of Development Permit Application No. 26DP01-23, communicated in its Notice of Decision dated August 5, 2026, is confirmed. The requested approval of the existing over-height fence is refused.

[83] This decision determines the development permit appeal. It does not issue or vary a stop order, set a removal deadline, or authorize the as-built fence. Any subsequent enforcement step is a separate matter for the Development Authority under its lawful powers.

APPEAL RIGHTS

[84] Under section 688 of the MGA, an appeal from this decision lies to the Alberta Court of Appeal on a question of law or jurisdiction, with permission of a judge of that Court. An application for permission to appeal must be filed and served within 30 days after the issue of the decision sought to be appealed. The filing, service and notice requirements of section 688 must be followed. The Court determines whether permission is granted.

Dated October 6, 2026



Jamie Kraley, Chair

For the Summer Village of Nakamun Park Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

APPENDIX A

Exhibits and supplementary hearing materials

The following six exhibits were identified by the Clerk at the opening of the hearing. Dates below follow the exhibit list as read into the record.

Exhibit 1 - Notice of Decision issued by the Municipal Planning Commission for the Summer Village of Nakamun Park, dated August 5, 2026.

Exhibit 2 - Notice of Appeal submitted by [redacted] received August 25, 2026.

Exhibit 3 - Notice of Hearing issued by Emily House, Clerk, on September 2, 2026.

Exhibit 4 - Summer Village of Nakamun Park written submission, provided by Tony Sonnleitner, Development Officer, on September 16, 2026, for the September 23 hearing, including the Development Officer's report and supporting application and decision materials.

Exhibit 5 - Appellant's supporting submission, identified in the exhibit list and at the opening of the hearing as submitted September 15, 2026. Its cover page bears a submission date of September 16, 2026. It includes site information, photographs, measurements, bylaw excerpts, a supporting neighbour letter and the MPC decision.

Exhibit 6 - Submission opposing the appeal provided by [redacted] on September 15, 2026.

The following additional materials were presented during the hearing:

Exhibit 7 - Summer Village of Nakamun Park survey submitted by the Appellant's representative.

Exhibit 8 - Newcastle Centre GP Ltd v Edmonton (City), 2014 ABCA 295, and Tymchak v Edmonton (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board), 2012 ABCA 22, submitted by the Appellant's representative.

Outlook

YRL Draft 2027 Budget

From Laurie Haak <LHaak@yrl.ab.ca>
Date Mon 9/28/2026 12:41 PM
Cc YRL Chair <chair@yrl.ab.ca>; Karla Palichuk <KPalichuk@yrl.ab.ca>; Jocie Wilson <JWilson@yrl.ab.ca>

3 attachments (2 MB)

YRL Chair Letter to Members - September 2026.pdf; YRL 2027 Budget Overview.pdf; YRL Draft 2027 Budget with Projections for 2028 to 2030.pdf;

Dear CAOs and Superintendents,

Please find attached a letter from YRL Board Chair Tara Elwood, the 2027 budget overview and the **draft 2027 budget** with projections for 2028 to 2030.

The YRL Executive Committee passed a motion on August 31 recommending the YRL Board of Trustees approve the budget as presented.

The Board will meet October 5 to review the draft budget and ask questions, and they will vote on the budget at the annual organizational meeting on December 7.

Thank you and we look forward to hearing your feedback!

Note: This email and attachments will be sent to YRL Trustees and Member Public Library Directors/Managers for their information.

Laurie Haak
SHE/HER
Executive Assistant

P: 780-962-2003 EXT 221
yrl.ab.ca | Box 4270, Spruce Grove, AB T7X 3B4

Yellowhead Regional Library
Libraries VALUE BEYOND words

Yellowhead Regional Library

Alberta LIVING WAGE Employer

September 28, 2026

Dear Municipal Administrators and School Division Superintendents,

As you know, this year Yellowhead Regional Library (YRL) reached out to its municipal members to seek an increase in its per capita levy rate. Information was sent to every municipal member, and YRL gave presentations to 19 Councils in the region. Of its 54 members, 50 municipalities responded and 100% of municipalities approved the rate increase or accepted the report as information. **All agreed that a sustainable regional library system is worth the investment.**

This was a resounding endorsement of the value that residents receive from their local library's partnership with YRL. The rate changed from $4.85 to $5.60 per capita, yet YRL still remains the lowest rate among regional library systems in the province.

This increase, the first greater than two per cent since 2010, allows YRL to manage the impacts of inflation and rising costs, while continuing to deliver the services that member public and school libraries count on. Going forward, YRL will balance seeking annual inflationary-level increases with possible population increases to avoid future operational circumstances that require significant adjustments or increases.

These incremental increases, in keeping with inflation, will help YRL maintain sustainable funding and reliable ongoing services.

YRL works hard to be prudent stewards of its funding. Municipalities and school divisions can be assured of YRL's commitment to delivering on its mandate through the Master Membership Agreement and Strategic Plan, as it helps local libraries meet the needs of their residents.

Attached in this package is our proposed 2027 budget and supporting documents including projections for 2028 to 2030, as well as the results of the 2027 levy increase. **Please share these documents with your Councils and Boards to keep them informed**.

If you have any questions, I encourage you to connect with YRL Director Karla Palichuk, kpalichuk@yrl.ab.ca or 780-962-2003 (toll free 1-877-962-2003), who would be pleased to respond or meet with you.

Yours truly,

Tara Elwood, Board Chair
Yellowhead Regional Library

Libraries VALUE BEYOND words

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
General Fund

REVENUE	2025	2026	2027	VARIANCE	
R1 Additional Allotment	$ 180,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ -	Additional allotment purchased by member libraries; offset in Line E16: *Purchases - Allotment*.
R2 Contract Services	$ 85,904	$ 85,904	$ 21,476	$ (64,428)	TRAC Central Site Agreement; decrease due to Polaris cloud migration and contract ending in April 2027.
R3 Interest	$ 136,000	$ 180,000	$ 120,000	$ (60,000)	Estimate based on average account balances and dropping interest rates.
R4 Local Appropriations	$ 1,430,809	$ 1,460,920	$ 1,695,310	$ 234,391	Increased to $5.60 per capita based on Municipal Affairs latest official population figures (2025) remaining stable; increase due to levy increase approved by municipal members in July 2026.
R5 Non-allotment Sales	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ -	Prediction for the volume of non-allotment purchases; reflects trend of last three years; offset in Line E18: *Purchases - Non-allotment*.
R6 Operating Grant	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	$ -	Public Library Services Branch operational grant based on 2019 population figures and remaining at $4.75 per capita; includes Library Services Grant paid out to libraries and offset in Line E9: *Library Grant Disbursements*.
R7 Other Grants	$ 31,926	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ -	Public Library Services Branch On-Reserve/On-Settlement Grant; offset in Line E13: *On-Reserve/On-Settlement Grant*.
R8 School System Levy	$ 156,595	$ 155,812	$ 152,811	$ (3,001)	Reflects recent trend of relatively stable student populations and no levy increase for 2027.
R9 Workshop and Conference	$ 12,000	$ 12,000	$ -	$ (12,000)	Revenue from workshop and conference attendees; offset in E24: Workshops and Conferences.
TOTAL REVENUE	**$3,698,683**	**$3,787,831**	**$ 3,882,793**	**$ 94,962**	

EXPENSES	2025	2026	2027	VARIANCE	
E1 Bank Charges and Miscellaneous	$ 2,780	$ 3,500	$ 3,500	$ -	Bank and credit card fees, and miscellaneous charges.
E2 Building Maintenance	$ 45,000	$ 48,500	$ 50,925	$ 2,425	Non-capital building maintenance (mechanical, cleaning, incidentals); increase due to inflation of labour and material costs.
E3 Membership Support	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ -	Technical fixes/replacement of equipment; includes Technology Services staff travel to member libraries (fuel, meals and, if required, hotels).
E4 Delivery	$ 50,547	$ 50,500	$ 53,025	$ 2,525	Direct non-salary costs of YRL delivery system.
E5 Employee Benefits	$ 381,763	$ 373,772	$ 412,873	$ 39,101	Reflects known Canada Pension Plan increases and estimate of benefit premium increases.
E6 Employee Salaries	$ 1,931,281	$ 2,065,292	$ 2,043,501	$ (21,791)	Reflects known staff changes, director's contract, and estimate of grid increases; decrease due to estimate of new staff paid lower on the grid.
E7 Insurance	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ -	Alberta Municipal Services Corporation provides all coverages (auto, building, liability, cybersecurity).
E8 Leases and Licensing	$ 188,296	$ 153,700	$ 173,500	$ 19,800	Licensing costs for software/equipment leasing and maintenance (often reactive); increase due to new YRL Fortiguard costs with cessation of TRAC Central Site Contract.
E9 Library Grant Disbursements	$ 60,486	$ 60,486	$ 62,028	$ 1,542	Funds distributed to designated libraries, as directed; offset in Line R6: *Operating Grant*.
E10 Library Supplies and Shipping	$ 48,000	$ 40,000	$ 45,000	$ 5,000	Processing supplies (mylar, labels, barcodes) and incoming shipment charges; increased costs communicated by vendors in 2026.

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
General Fund

EXPENSES	2025	2026	2027	VARIANCE	
E11 Memberships	$ 20,600	$ 20,600	$ 20,600	$ -	Alberta Library Trustees' Association, Library Association of Alberta, The Alberta Library, and Canadian Urban Libraries Council.
E12 Office Supplies and Equipment	$ 23,000	$ 20,000	$ 10,000	$ (10,000)	General office supplies and internal hardware/software; decrease due to actuals spent on capital asset office furniture replacement in 2024/2025.
E13 On-Reserve/On-Settlement Grant	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ -	Offset in Line R7: *Other Grants*.
E14 Printing and Promotion	$ 5,500	$ 5,500	$ 3,000	$ (2,500)	Printing costs for communications and advocacy work; YRL portion of regional library system trade show participation costs.
E15 Professional Services	$ 189,430	$ 148,500	$ 154,000	$ 5,500	Annual audit fee increase; technical support and incidental legal expenses; majority due to ACSI (IT) managed services; communications contract increased based on needs.
E16 Purchases - Allotment	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ -	Allotment maintained at $0.75 per capita for public libraries and $1.00 per FTE student for school libraries; includes additional allotment purchased by member libraries and offset in Line R1: *Additional Allotment*.
E17 Purchases - HQ Collections	$ 268,000	$ 243,500	$ 200,000	$ (43,500)	New/current online content; majority negotiated by The Alberta Library for members; decrease due to actual needs based on new eContent Strategy for current plan of service.
E18 Purchases - Non-allotment	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ -	Offset in Line R5: *Non-allotment Sales*.
E19 Staff Travel Expenses/Recruitment	$ 16,500	$ 10,000	$ 8,000	$ (2,000)	Non-IT staff travel (fuel, meals and, if required, hotels); recruitment-related costs; decrease due to actual needs.
E20 Staff Professional Development	$ 53,200	$ 32,300	$ 32,300	$ -	Includes training, technical training and conference; continuing education.
E21 Telephone and Utilities	$ 100,175	$ 96,075	$ 88,000	$ (8,075)	Off-site data service fees; decrease due to actual needs.
E22 TRAC Expenses	$ 244,771	$ 228,212	$ 246,000	$ 17,788	YRL portion of TRAC budget; capital hardware purchases; increase due to actual costs in 2026.
E23 Trustee Expenses	$ 33,975	$ 30,000	$ 26,000	$ (4,000)	Board and committee meeting costs, advocacy and conference; decrease due to operational results.
E24 Workshops and Conference	$ 37,050	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ -	Stronger Together Conference and in-house workshops; remains stable due to operational results.
TOTAL EXPENSES	**$4,300,600**	**$4,250,683**	**$ 4,252,498**	**$ 1,815**	
General Fund: Surplus (Deficiency) Revenue Over Expenses	**$ (601,917)**	**$ (462,853)**	**$ (369,706)**		
Cost-benefit Ratio	**116.27%**	**112.22%**	**109.52%**		

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
2026 Fund Reserves

	General Fund	Equity in Capital Assets	Operational Contingency Fund	Capital Fund	Total
	$ (625,222)	$ 655,134	$ 1,981,111	$ 289,623	$ 2,300,646
Interfund Transfers Approved March 2026	$ 625,222		$ (625,222)		
Balance at 2025 Year End	**$ -**	**$ 655,134**	**$ 1,355,889**	**$ 289,623**	**$ 2,300,646**
Excess to June 30, 2026 Revenue Over Expenses	$ 390,410				
Amortization to June 30, 2026		$ (372,135)			
Capital Asset Purchases * includes building improvement					
Capital Asset Disposals					
Deferred Contribution		$ 160,306			
Balance at June 30, 2026	**$ 390,410**	**$ 443,305**	**$ 1,355,889**	**$ 289,623**	**$ 2,479,227**

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
All Funds

REVENUE		2025 Budget	2026 Budget	2027 Projection	
R1	Additional Allotment	$ 180,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	-
R2	Contract Services	$ 85,904	$ 85,904	$ 21,476	↓
	Deferred Gov't Contributions	$ 160,307	$ 160,307	$ 160,307	-
R3	Interest	$ 136,000	$ 180,000	$ 120,000	↓
R4	Local Appropriations	$ 1,430,809	$ 1,460,920	$ 1,695,310	↑
R5	Non-allotment Sales	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	-
R6	Operating Grant	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	-
R7	Other Grants	$ 31,926	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	-
R8	School System Levy	$ 156,595	$ 155,812	$ 152,811	↓
R9	Workshops and Conference	$ 12,000	$ 12,000	$ -	↓
	TOTAL REVENUE	**$ 3,858,990**	**$ 3,948,138**	**$ 4,043,100**	

EXPENSES		2025 Budget	2026 Budget	2027 Budget Projection	
	Amortization of Capital Assets	$ 271,848	$ 251,346	$ 347,928	↑
E1	Bank Charges and Miscellaneous	$ 2,780	$ 3,500	$ 3,500	-
E2	Building Maintenance	$ 45,000	$ 48,500	$ 50,925	↑
E3	Membership Support	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	-
E4	Delivery	$ 50,547	$ 50,500	$ 53,025	↑
E5	Employee Benefits	$ 381,763	$ 373,772	$ 412,873	↑
E6	Employee Salaries	$ 1,931,281	$ 2,065,292	$ 2,043,501	↓
E7	Insurance	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	-
E8	Leases and Licensing	$ 188,296	$ 153,700	$ 173,500	↑
E9	Library Grant Disbursements	$ 60,486	$ 60,486	$ 62,028	↑
E10	Library Supplies and Shipping	$ 48,000	$ 40,000	$ 45,000	↑

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
All Funds

EXPENSES		2025 Budget	2026 Budget	2027 Budget Projection	
E11	Memberships	$ 20,600	$ 20,600	$ 20,600	-
E12	Office Supplies and Equipment	$ 23,000	$ 20,000	$ 10,000	⬇
E13	On-Reserve/On-Settlement Grant	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	-
E14	Printing and Promotion	$ 5,500	$ 5,500	$ 3,000	⬇
E15	Professional Services	$ 189,430	$ 148,500	$ 154,000	⬆
E16	Purchases - Allotment	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	-
E17	Purchases - HQ Collections	$ 268,000	$ 243,500	$ 200,000	⬇
E18	Purchases - Non-allotment	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	-
E19	Staff Travel Expenses/Recruitment	$ 16,500	$ 10,000	$ 8,000	⬇
E20	Staff Professional Development	$ 53,200	$ 32,300	$ 32,300	-
E21	Telephone and Utilities	$ 100,175	$ 96,075	$ 88,000	⬇
E22	TRAC Expenses	$ 244,771	$ 228,212	$ 246,000	⬆
E23	Trustee Expenses	$ 33,975	$ 30,000	$ 26,000	⬇
E24	Workshops and Conference	$ 37,050	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	-
	TOTAL EXPENSES	**$ 4,572,448**	**$ 4,502,029**	**$ 4,600,426**	
	All Funds: Surplus (Deficiency) Revenue Over Expenses	**$ (713,458)**	**$ (553,891)**	**$ (557,327)**	
	General Fund: Surplus (Deficiency) Revenue Over Expenses	**$ (601,917)**	**$ (462,852)**	**$ (369,706)**	

Capital assets:

Telephone System	$ 56,570
Computers (staff desktops x5 and HVAC monitoring & software laptops x2)	$ 15,000
	$ 71,570

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
2028-2030 Projections

REVENUE	2027 Projection	2028 Projection	2029 Projection	2030 Projection
R1 Additional Allotment	$ 200,000	$ 210,000	$ 220,500	$ 231,525
R2 Contract Services	$ 21,476	$ -	$ -	$ -
Deferred Gov't Contributions	$ 160,307	$ 160,307	$ 160,307	$ 160,307
R3 Interest	$ 120,000	$ 120,000	$ 120,000	$ 120,000
R4 Local Appropriations	$ 1,695,310	$ 1,729,217	$ 1,763,801	$ 1,799,077
R5 Non-allotment Sales	$ 200,000	$ 210,000	$ 220,500	$ 231,525
R6 Operating Grant	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449	$ 1,465,449
R7 Other Grants	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746
R8 School System Levy	$ 152,811	$ 155,867	$ 158,985	$ 162,164
TOTAL REVENUE	**4,043,100**	**4,078,586**	**4,137,288**	**4,197,793**

EXPENSES	2027 Budget	2028 Projection	2029 Projection	2030 Projection
Amortization of Capital Assets	$ 347,928	$ 347,928	$ 347,928	$ 347,928
E1 Bank Charges and Miscellaneous	$ 3,500	$ 3,588	$ 3,677	$ 3,769
E2 Building Maintenance	$ 50,925	$ 52,198	$ 54,808	$ 57,548
E3 Membership Support	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500
E4 Delivery	$ 53,025	$ 54,351	$ 57,068	$ 59,922
E5 Employee Benefits	$ 412,873	$ 433,517	$ 455,193	$ 477,952
E6 Employee Salaries	$ 2,043,501	$ 2,043,501	$ 2,043,501	$ 2,043,501
E7 Insurance	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
E8 Leases and Licensing	$ 173,500	$ 182,175	$ 194,927	$ 208,572
E9 Library Grant Disbursement	$ 62,028	$ 62,028	$ 62,028	$ 62,028
E10 Library Supplies and Shipping	$ 45,000	$ 45,000	$ 45,000	$ 45,000
E11 Memberships	$ 20,600	$ 21,012	$ 21,432	$ 21,861
E12 Office Supplies and Equipment	$ 10,000	$ 12,000	$ 12,000	$ 13,000
E13 On-Reserve/On-Settlement Grant	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746	$ 27,746

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
2028-2030 Projections

EXPENSES	2027 Budget	2028 Projection	2029 Projection	2030 Projection
E14 Printing and Promotion	$ 3,000	$ 5,502	$ 5,503	$ 5,504
E15 Professional Services	$ 154,000	$ 161,700	$ 174,636	$ 188,607
E16 Purchases - Allotment	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000
E17 Purchases - HQ Collections	$ 200,000	$ 205,000	$ 210,125	$ 215,378
E18 Purchases - Non-allotment	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
E19 Staff Travel Expenses/Recruitment	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ 8,000
E20 Staff Professional Development	$ 32,300	$ 32,300	$ 32,300	$ 32,300
E21 Telephone and Utilities	$ 88,000	$ 92,400	$ 97,020	$ 101,871
E22 TRAC Expense	$ 246,000	$ 246,000	$ 246,000	$ 246,000
E23 Trustee Expenses	$ 26,000	$ 26,650	$ 27,316	$ 27,999
E24 Workshops and Conference	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	**$ 4,600,426**	**$ 4,655,095**	**$ 4,718,709**	**$ 4,786,987**
All Funds: Surplus (Deficiency) Revenue Over Expenses	**$ (557,327)**	**$ (576,509)**	**$ (581,421)**	**$ (589,193)**
Reserve Fund Transfer to (from) Operational Contingency Fund	**$ (557,327)**	**$ (576,509)**	**$ (581,421)**	**$ (589,193)**
Purchases - Capital Assets	**$ 71,570**	**$ 200,884**	**$ 70,426**	**$ 528,910**

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member Municipal Appropriations and Allotment

Municipality	Municipal Affairs 2025 Official Populations as of January 2026	2027 YRL Municipal Appropriations at $5.60/Capita (Based on 2025 Off Pop)	2027 YRL Allotment to Public Libraries at $0.75/Capita (Based on 2025 Off Pop)
ALBERTA BEACH	864	$ 4,838.40	$ 648.00
BARRHEAD	4,320	$ 24,192.00	$ 3,240.00
BARRHEAD NO. 11, COUNTY OF	5,877	$ 32,911.20	$ 4,407.75
BEAUMONT	20,888	$ 116,972.80	$ 15,666.00
BIRCH COVE	67	$ 375.20	$ 50.25
BRAZEAU COUNTY	7,179	$ 40,202.40	$ 5,384.25
BRETON	567	$ 3,175.20	$ 425.25
CALMAR	2,183	$ 12,224.80	$ 1,637.25
CASTLE ISLAND	15	$ 84.00	$ 11.25
CLYDE	415	$ 2,324.00	$ 311.25
CRYSTAL SPRINGS	74	$ 414.40	$ 55.50
DEVON	6,545	$ 36,652.00	$ 4,908.75
DRAYTON VALLEY	7,291	$ 40,829.60	$ 5,468.25
EDSON	8,374	$ 46,894.40	$ 6,280.50
GRANDVIEW	143	$ 800.80	$ 107.25
HINTON	9,817	$ 54,975.20	$ 7,362.75
JASPER, MUNICIPALITY OF	4,738	$ 26,532.80	$ 3,553.50
KAPASIWIN	24	$ 134.40	$ 18.00
LAC STE. ANNE COUNTY	11,300	$ 63,280.00	$ 8,475.00
LAKEVIEW	29	$ 162.40	$ 21.75
LEDUC	36,060	$ 201,936.00	$ 27,045.00
LEDUC COUNTY	14,416	$ 80,729.60	$ 10,812.00
MA-ME-O BEACH	128	$ 716.80	$ 96.00
MAYERTHORPE	1,343	$ 7,520.80	$ 1,007.25
MILLET	1,890	$ 10,584.00	$ 1,417.50
NAKAMUN PARK	78	$ 436.80	$ 58.50
NORRIS BEACH	71	$ 397.60	$ 53.25
ONOWAY	966	$ 5,409.60	$ 724.50
PARKLAND COUNTY	32,205	$ 180,348.00	$ 24,153.75

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member Municipal Appropriations and Allotment

Municipality	Municipal Affairs 2025 Official Populations as of January 2026	2027 YRL Municipal Appropriations at $5.60/Capita (Based on 2025 Off Pop)	2027 YRL Allotment to Public Libraries at $0.75/Capita (Based on 2025 Off Pop)
POPLAR BAY	113	$ 632.80	$ 84.75
ROSS HAVEN	126	$ 705.60	$ 94.50
SANDY BEACH	278	$ 1,556.80	$ 208.50
SEBA BEACH	229	$ 1,282.40	$ 171.75
SILVER BEACH	55	$ 308.00	$ 41.25
SILVER SANDS	214	$ 1,198.40	$ 160.50
SOUTH VIEW	72	$ 403.20	$ 54.00
SPRING LAKE	711	$ 3,981.60	$ 533.25
SPRUCE GROVE	38,985	$ 218,316.00	$ 29,238.75
STONY PLAIN	17,993	$ 100,760.80	$ 13,494.75
SUNRISE BEACH	153	$ 856.80	$ 114.75
SUNSET POINT	257	$ 1,439.20	$ 192.75
SWAN HILLS	1,201	$ 6,725.60	$ 900.75
THORSBY	967	$ 5,415.20	$ 725.25
VAL QUENTIN	158	$ 884.80	$ 118.50
WARBURG	676	$ 3,785.60	$ 507.00
WEST COVE	222	$ 1,243.20	$ 166.50
WESTLOCK	4,921	$ 27,557.60	$ 3,690.75
WESTLOCK COUNTY	7,186	$ 40,241.60	$ 5,389.50
WETASKIWIN	13,409	$ 75,090.40	$ 10,056.75
WETASKIWIN COUNTY NO. 10	11,217	$ 62,815.20	$ 8,412.75
WHITECOURT	9,927	$ 55,591.20	$ 7,445.25
WOODLANDS COUNTY	5,254	$ 29,422.40	$ 3,940.50
YELLOWHEAD COUNTY	10,426	$ 58,385.60	$ 7,819.50
YELLOWSTONE	117	$ 655.20	$ 87.75
TOTAL	**302,734**	**$1,695,310.40**	**$227,050.50**

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member Municipal Library Services Grant and YRL Operating Grant

Municipality	2019 Population Estimates Used by Municipal Affairs	2027 YRL Operating Grant from Province at $4.75/Capita (Based on 2019 Pop Est)	2027 Library Services Grant from Province (through YRL) at $5.60/Capita (Based on 2019 Pop Est)
ALBERTA BEACH	1,018	$ 4,835.50	
BARRHEAD	4,579	$ 21,750.25	
BARRHEAD NO. 11, COUNTY OF	6,288	$ 29,868.00	
BEAUMONT	19,236	$ 91,371.00	
BIRCH COVE	45	$ 213.75	$ 252.00
BRAZEAU COUNTY	7,771	$ 36,912.25	$ 43,517.60
BRETON	574	$ 2,726.50	
CALMAR	2,228	$ 10,583.00	
CASTLE ISLAND	10	$ 47.50	$ 56.00
CLYDE	430	$ 2,042.50	$ 2,408.00
CRYSTAL SPRINGS	51	$ 242.25	$ 285.60
DEVON	6,578	$ 31,245.50	
DRAYTON VALLEY	7,235	$ 34,366.25	
EDSON	8,414	$ 39,966.50	
GRANDVIEW	114	$ 541.50	$ 638.40
HINTON	9,882	$ 46,939.50	
JASPER, MUNICIPALITY OF	4,590	$ 21,802.50	
KAPASIWIN	10	$ 47.50	$ 56.00
LAC STE. ANNE COUNTY	10,899	$ 51,770.25	
LAKEVIEW	30	$ 142.50	$ 168.00
LEDUC	33,032	$ 156,902.00	
LEDUC COUNTY	13,780	$ 65,455.00	
MA-ME-O BEACH	110	$ 522.50	$ 616.00
MAYERTHORPE	1,320	$ 6,270.00	
MILLET	1,945	$ 9,238.75	
NAKAMUN PARK	96	$ 456.00	$ 537.60
NORRIS BEACH	38	$ 180.50	$ 212.80
ONOWAY	1,029	$ 4,887.75	
PARKLAND COUNTY	32,097	$ 152,460.75	

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member Municipal Library Services Grant and YRL Operating Grant

Municipality	2019 Population Estimates Used by Municipal Affairs	2027 YRL Operating Grant from Province at $4.75/Capita (Based on 2019 Pop Est)	2027 Library Services Grant from Province (through YRL) at $5.60/Capita (Based on 2019 Pop Est)
POPLAR BAY	103	$ 489.25	$ 576.80
ROSS HAVEN	160	$ 760.00	$ 896.00
SANDY BEACH	278	$ 1,320.50	$ 1,542.90
SEBA BEACH	169	$ 802.75	
SILVER BEACH	65	$ 308.75	$ 364.00
SILVER SANDS	160	$ 760.00	$ 896.00
SOUTH VIEW	67	$ 318.25	$ 375.20
SPRING LAKE	699	$ 3,320.25	$ 3,914.40
SPRUCE GROVE	35,766	$ 169,888.50	
STONY PLAIN	17,842	$ 84,749.50	
SUNRISE BEACH	135	$ 641.25	$ 756.00
SUNSET POINT	169	$ 802.75	$ 946.40
SWAN HILLS	1,301	$ 6,179.75	
THORSBY	1,015	$ 4,821.25	
VAL QUENTIN	252	$ 1,197.00	$ 1,411.20
WARBURG	766	$ 3,638.50	
WEST COVE	149	$ 707.75	$ 834.40
WESTLOCK	5,101	$ 24,229.75	
WESTLOCK COUNTY	7,220	$ 34,295.00	
WETASKIWIN	12,655	$ 60,111.25	
WETASKIWIN COUNTY NO. 10	11,181	$ 53,109.75	
WHITECOURT	10,204	$ 48,469.00	
WOODLANDS COUNTY	4,754	$ 22,581.50	
YELLOWHEAD COUNTY	10,995	$ 52,226.25	
YELLOWSTONE	137	$ 650.75	$ 767.20
TOTAL	**294,772**	**$1,400,181.00**	**$62,028.50**

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member School Division Levies and Allotment

Northern Gateway Public Schools	Regular	0.5 FTE	Alberta Education FTE as of Sept 2026	2027 YRL School Division Levies at $15.71/FTE	2027 YRL Allotment to School Libraries at $1.00/FTE
Darwell School Library	138	15	130.5	$ 2,050.16	$ 130.50
Elmer Elson Elementary School Library	324	45	301.5	$ 4,736.57	$ 301.50
Gateway Academy Onoway	0	25	12.5	$ 196.38	$ 12.50
Gateway Academy Whitecourt	0	100	50.0	$ 785.50	$ 50.00
Grasmere School Library	116	11	110.5	$ 1,735.96	$ 110.50
Hilltop Junior/Senior High School Library	540	0	540.0	$ 8,483.40	$ 540.00
Mayerthorpe Junior/Senior High School Library	287	0	287.0	$ 4,508.77	$ 287.00
Onoway Elementary School Library	427	58	398.0	$ 6,252.58	$ 398.00
Onoway Junior/Senior High School Library	517	0	517.0	$ 8,122.07	$ 517.00
Pat Hardy Primary School Library	291	35	273.5	$ 4,296.69	$ 273.50
Percy Baxter Middle School Library	366	0	366.0	$ 5,749.86	$ 366.00
Rich Valley School Library	101	11	95.5	$ 1,500.31	$ 95.50
Sangudo Community School Library	97	7	93.5	$ 1,468.89	$ 93.50
Whitecourt Central Elementary School Library	326	44	304.0	$ 4,775.84	$ 304.00
Subtotal	**3,530**	**351.0**	**3,479.5**	**$ 54,662.95**	**$3,479.50**

Pembina Hills School Division	Regular	0.5 FTE	Alberta Education FTE as of Sept 2026	2027 YRL School Division Levies at $15.71/FTE	2027 YRL Allotment to School Libraries at $1.00/FTE
Barrhead Composite High School Library	671	0	671.0	$ 10,541.41	$ 671.00
Barrhead Outreach	0	29	14.5	$ 227.80	$ 14.50
Busby School Library	125	17	116.5	$ 1,830.22	$ 116.50
Dunstable School Library	64	10	59.0	$ 926.89	$ 59.00
École Barrhead Elementary School Library	599	112	543.0	$ 8,530.53	$ 543.00
École Westlock Elementary School Library	462	98	413.0	$ 6,488.23	$ 413.00
Eleanor Hall School Library	194	19	184.5	$ 2,898.50	$ 184.50
Fort Assiniboine School Library	86	11	80.5	$ 1,264.66	$ 80.50
Neerlandia Public Christian School Library	257	30	242.0	$ 3,801.82	$ 242.00
Pembina North Community School Library	186	26	173.0	$ 2,717.83	$ 173.00
Pibroch Colony School Library	0	20	10.0	$ 157.10	$ 10.00
R.F. Staples Secondary School Library	573	0	573.0	$ 9,001.83	$ 573.00
Sunny Bend Colony School Library	0	19	9.5	$ 149.25	$ 9.50
Swan Hills School Library	188	20	178.0	$ 2,796.38	$ 178.00
Westlock Outreach	0	25	12.5	$ 196.38	$ 12.50
Subtotal	**3,405**	**436.0**	**3,280.0**	**$ 51,528.80**	**$ 3,280.00**

DRAFT

Yellowhead Regional Library Draft 2027 Budget
Member School Division Levies and Allotment

Wetaskiwin Regional Public Schools	Regular	0.5 FTE	Alberta Education FTE *as of Sept 2026*	2027 YRL School Division Levies at $15.71/FTE	2027 YRL Allotment to School Libraries at $1.00/FTE
Alder Flats Elementary School Library	70	12	64.0	$ 1,005.44	$ 64.00
Buck Mountain Central School Library	118	0	118.0	$ 1,853.78	$ 118.00
Centennial School Library	88	8	84.0	$ 1,319.64	$ 84.00
Clear Vista School Library	414	35	396.5	$ 6,229.02	$ 396.50
Falun Elementary School Library	104	8	100.0	$ 1,571.00	$ 100.00
Griffiths-Scott School Library	268	21	257.5	$ 4,045.33	$ 257.50
Lakedell Elementary School Library	78	9	73.5	$ 1,154.69	$ 73.50
Lynn Lauren Early Education School	0	50	25.0	$ 392.75	$ 25.00
Norwood School Library	176	16	168.0	$ 2,639.28	$ 168.00
Parkdale School Library	169	12	163.0	$ 2,560.73	$ 163.00
Pigeon Lake Regional School Library	275	0	275.0	$ 4,320.25	$ 275.00
Pine Haven Colony School Library	21	0	21.0	$ 329.91	$ 21.00
Pipestone School Library	68	7	64.5	$ 1,013.30	$ 64.50
Queen Elizabeth School Library	179	17	170.5	$ 2,678.56	$ 170.50
Silver Creek Colony School Library	12	0	12.0	$ 188.52	$ 12.00
Wetaskiwin Composite High School Library	850	0	850.0	$ 13,353.50	$ 850.00
Wetaskiwin Outreach	0	132	66.0	$ 1,036.86	$ 66.00
Winfield School Library	63	8	59.0	$ 926.89	$ 59.00
Subtotal	**2,953**	**335.0**	**2,967.5**	**$ 46,619.43**	**$ 2,967.50**
TOTAL	**9,888**	**1,122.0**	**9,727.0**	**$ 152,811.17**	**$ 9,727.00**

DRAFT

Fire Rescue International

Box 1550
Onoway, Alberta T0E 1V0
Canada
accounting@firerescueinternational.net

INVOICE

Invoice No.: 1434
Date: 10/02/2026

PAID

Sold to:

Summer Village of Nakamun Park

Dwight Darren Moskalyk
P.O. Box 1250
Onoway, Alberta T0E 1V0
Canada

Business No.: 770543148RT0001

Quantity	Description	Tax	Unit Price	Amount
	Job: 2026-75 Incident Date: Aug 15, 2026			
2.75	Charlie 1	G	225.00	618.75
2.00	Charlie 4	G	225.00	450.00
1.00	Medical No Charge	G	-1,068.75	-1,068.75
	Type: Medical Aid Address: [redacted] Nakamun Park Responding Agencies: Fire Rescue International EMS			
	Subtotal:			
	G - GST @ 5%			
	GST			-30.94
	GST, not included			30.94
			Total Amount	
			Amount Paid	
			Amount Owing	

cao@svnakamun.com

From: ma.lgffcapital@gov.ab.ca
Sent: October 6, 2026 3:24 PM
To: Wendy Wildman
Subject: LGFF and Community Stream Spending Timelines

Dear Chief Administrative Officers and/or Administrators,

During the Minister's 2026 Summer Tour, several local governments raised concerns about the requirement to spend capital funding within five years of the calendar year in which the funding was allocated.

As you know, this requirement applies to both the Local Government Fiscal Framework (LGFF) Capital and the Build Communities Strong Fund – Community Stream. For example, funding allocated in 2024 must be spent by December 31, 2029. The five-year spending period is intended to balance flexibility and accountability, allowing communities to accumulate funding for larger projects while ensuring infrastructure investments proceed in a timely manner.

Municipal Affairs recognizes that a few smaller communities may need additional time to build up sufficient funding to complete significant infrastructure projects. The Minister has indicated he will consider these requests when they are received.

It is worth noting that in many cases, it may be more cost-effective to proceed with a project earlier by utilizing borrowing to bridge the funding gap. Future grant allocations can then be used to repay the debt, allowing communities to address infrastructure needs sooner and take advantage of current construction prices. It also ensures communities maintain eligibility for annual grant payments, provided program reporting requirements are met.

If you would like to discuss funding options available or need additional information on meeting your local government's spending timelines, please contact a grant advisor toll-free by first dialing 310-0000, then 780-422-7125.

Sincerely,

Victoria Bachmann
Assistant Deputy Minister, Municipal Assessment and Grants

cao@svnakamun.com

From: Dylan Bressey <president@abmunis.ca>
Sent: October 7, 2026 4:39 PM
To: Wendy Wildman
Subject: Update on RCMP Collective Bargaining

Dear Municipal Colleagues:

I am writing to share an update on the current RCMP collective bargaining process. This update is based on a presentation by Treasury Board Canada (TBC) at a September 22, 2026, Contract Management Committee meeting. The Contract Management Committee is the forum through which municipal, provincial, territorial, federal, and RCMP representatives discuss issues related to the Provincial and Municipal Police Services Agreements.

Background
The first RCMP collective agreement expired on March 31, 2023, and included a total compounded increase of 24% to RCMP base salaries over five years. The second collective agreement expired on March 31, 2025, and included a 4% salary increase per year over two years, as well as a one-time allowance of $2,500.

The National Police Federation (NPF), which represents regular RCMP members, served the Government of Canada with notice to bargain in December 2024. The parties exchanged proposals in May 2025, and after further discussion and negotiation, bargaining proceeded to mediation in May 2026. According to TBC, wages were the only remaining outstanding issue following the May meetings, and the Government of Canada was hopeful that a new collective agreement would be reached in fall 2026, after additional mediation sessions over the summer.

Following the election of a new board and president, the NPF adopted a markedly different approach to negotiations. TBC reports that while the NPF attended one additional mediation session in July 2026, negotiations have since stalled. Although TBC is in contact weekly with union lawyers, these lawyers have yet to receive any directions for future negotiations. According to TBC, the NPF has not yet established a consensus bargaining position following the election of a new board and president, contributing to the current pause in negotiations. TBC is hopeful that the bargaining process will resume by Spring 2027; however, no timeline has been established to date. While negotiations remain stalled, municipalities should continue planning for future increases in RCMP policing costs.

What does this mean for ABmunis members?
ABmunis members that are policed by the RCMP should keep in mind that RCMP policing costs are projected to rise again once collective bargaining concludes, potentially as early as next year.

For municipalities that have Municipal Police Service Agreements (municipalities with populations over 5,000 policed by the RCMP), your multi-year financial plans (MYFPs) should already include an estimate of the impact of salary increases over the next five years to help with planning. Please note, however, that the final agreement could result in increases above and beyond the estimated rate used in your MYFP, as has happened in the past.

For municipalities that fall under the Provincial Police Service Agreement and are subject to the provincial police funding model (municipalities with populations under 5,000), the financial impacts of a new collective bargaining agreement are less clear. An updated police funding model came into effect on April 1, 2026. While this model states that municipal contributions “will be based on actual frontline policing costs from the most recently completed fiscal year”, it is unclear whether retroactive salary costs are considered part of “actual frontline policing costs”. Municipalities can request preliminary five-year cost estimates under the updated model by emailing abpfm@gov.ab.ca. However, please be aware that these estimates are calculated using 2024-25 provincial policing costs and assuming an 8% annual increase, which may not accurately reflect the financial impacts of the final collective bargaining agreement.

Next Steps

While significant uncertainty remains regarding both the timing and cost implications of a new agreement, municipalities should consider building contingencies into their 2027 budgets. ABmunis will continue to share updates as they become available and will continue advocating on members' behalf through the Contract Management Committee

As always, if you have any questions, concerns, or feedback to share, please feel free to contact me directly. You can also reach out to Kelly Santarossa, Senior Policy Analyst, who supports ABmunis' Policing, Justice, and Emergency Management Committee and represents ABmunis on the Contract Management Committee, at kelly@abmunis.ca or 780-419-4315.

Sincerely,

Dylan Bressey | President

E: president@abmunis.ca
300-8616 51 Ave Edmonton, AB T6E 6E6
Toll Free: 310-MUNI | 877-421-6644 | www.abmunis.ca



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email.

We respectfully acknowledge that we live, work, and play on the traditional and ancestral territories of many Indigenous, First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples. We acknowledge that what we call Alberta is the traditional and ancestral territory of many peoples, presently subject to Treaties 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10 and Six Regions of the Métis Nation of Alberta.

Alberta Transportation and Economic Corridors

Traffic Safety Services Division
4999 – 98 Avenue
Twin Atria Building
Edmonton, AB T6B 2X3
Canada
Telephone: 780-913-7581

Dear Chief Administrative Officer:

I am writing on behalf of Transportation and Economic Corridors to advise municipalities of changes to the administration of Alberta's Automated Traffic Enforcement (ATE) program.

Effective October 15, 2026, program administration and oversight of ATE transferred from the Ministry of Public Safety and Emergency Services to Transportation and Economic Corridors under the new Pilot Project (ATE) Regulation. This five-year pilot project will evaluate the effectiveness of ATE as a traffic safety measure while aligning program administration with the department's traffic safety mandate.

While the department will assume responsibility for program administration and oversight, the Minister of Transportation and Economic Corridors will hold decision-making authority under the regulation. The department, in collaboration with the municipality, will assess each approved ATE site at least once every two years to confirm that it continues to meet the exception requirements.

Day-to-day program requirements remain largely unchanged. Existing approved ATE sites, including approved exemption sites, will automatically carry over under the new regulation and do not require reapplication. Applications under review by Public Safety and Emergency Services prior to October 15, 2026, have been transferred to Transportation and Economic Corridors for consideration. Please note that any ATE site application denied by the Minister will not be eligible for reapplication until one year from the date the municipality receives notice of the decision.

Additional information, including the 2026 ATE Manual and application forms, is available here: www.alberta.ca/photo-radar-alberta. My department, in collaboration with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, will coordinate meetings with municipalities to provide an overview of the ATE program and address any questions.

Classification: Protected A

Thank you for your continued partnership in supporting traffic safety in communities across Alberta.

Sincerely,

Lynn Varty, MAL, CEC, PMP
Assistant Deputy Minister, Traffic Safety Services

Classification: Protected A