

Record of Proceedings

Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Hearing
Wednesday, September 23, 2026
3rd Floor - Council Chambers
315 Jespersen Ave
Spruce Grove, AB T7X 3E8

ATTENDANCE

Board Members:

Glenn Jensen, Chair
Pere Bekederemo
Liam McGrath
Keith Schultz

Administration:

Laura Hall, SDAB Clerk
Jaclyn Hager, Recording Secretary
Anshu Gupta, Development Officer
Lori Kustra, Supervisor of Development
Tanya Ouellette, Senior Development Officer

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Glenn Jensen called the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing to order at 8:08 p.m.

Chair Glenn Jensen provided an overview of the purpose of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Chair Glenn Jensen introduced Laura Hall, SDAB Clerk and indicated that it is the practice of the Board to have the Clerk participate in private discussions with the Board. No objections were raised from those in attendance.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked the sitting Board Members to introduce themselves.

Chair Glenn Jensen introduced the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board staff and City of Spruce Grove Administration.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Board Member Liam McGrath that the agenda for the Wednesday, September 23, 2026 Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing be approved as presented.

Carried.

APPEAL HEARING - PLDPR202600625

An appeal has been filed against the refusal of Development Permit PLDPR202600625 to construct a Secondary Suite at 11 Eton Link (Plan 2221764; Block 3; Lot 28).

Appellant/Applicant: Abdul Razeq, Kaloo Construction Ltd., 3716 Crang Vista SW, Edmonton, AB T6W 4G9

Chair Glenn Jensen called upon the SDAB Clerk to introduce the subject of the appeal.

Laura Hall, SDAB Clerk, advised of the appeal by Abdul Razeq of Kaloo Construction Ltd., against the refusal of Development Permit PLDPR202600625 to construct a secondary suite located at 11 Eton Link, legally described as Plan 2221764; Block 3; Lot 28. The Development Permit Application was refused on August 26, 2026.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked the SDAB Clerk if there were any preliminary matters to be addressed by the Board. The SDAB Clerk confirmed that there were no preliminary matters to address.

The SDAB Clerk noted that the property owner called and advised that they could not attend the Hearing, but the Appellant would be present and was authorized to speak on their behalf.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone present would like a postponement of the Hearing to a later date. There was no request for postponement.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if any Board Member felt the need to disclose any conflicts. The Board Members present had nothing to disclose.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if there were any objections to the Board Members sitting for the Hearing. No objections were raised by those present.

Chair Glenn Jensen explained the hearing process and the procedures to be followed and asked if anyone present had any concerns with the process outlined. No concerns with the process were raised by those present.

The Board marked the following documents as exhibits in the hearing. Exhibits 1-9 were part of the Agenda package and had been submitted in advance.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if there were any additional written submissions from anyone present. No additional submissions were provided.

Submission of the Development Authority

Chair Glenn Jensen called upon the Development Authority for the City of Spruce Grove to provide their presentation.

Anshu Gupta, Development Officer, read the Development Officer's Report into the record and provided the following:

- The appeal is filed against the decision to refuse Development Permit No. PLDPR202600625 to construct a secondary suite at 11 Eton Link.
- The subject site is zoned R1 – Mixed Low to Medium Density Residential District and legally described as Plan 2221764; Block 3; Lot 28.
- The site is developed with a Single Detached Dwelling and a rear detached garage.
- The Application to develop a Secondary Suite was received on June 15, 2026, was refused on August 26, 2026, and an Appeal was received on September 1.
- Refusal based on non-compliance of Section 85(2) and 14(5) of Land Use Bylaw C-842-12.
- The proposed development does not provide an additional one (1) parking stall for the Secondary Suite, in addition to the minimum two (2) parking stalls required for the main dwelling, therefore the application does not comply with Section 85(2) of the Land Use Bylaw C-824-12.
- Section 14(5) of Land Use Bylaw C-824-12 provides for a variance only in cases of hardship or practical difficulties particular to use, character, or situation of the land or buildings that are not common to other sites in the same Land Use District.
- The circumstances presented with the subject application do not demonstrate a hardship or practical difficulty particular to the subject property that would justify granting a variance to the minimum parking requirement.
- The Applicant offered to provide one of the two parking stalls required for the main dwelling for the Secondary Suite, leaving the total parking stalls at two instead of the required three.
- If the Board decides to allow the Secondary Suite, a number of conditions were recommended to be included in the approval.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had any questions for the Development Officer.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, asked the Development Officer to speak to conditions noted in the presentation.

Anshu Gupta, Development Officer, replied by stating the conditions are standard and applied to all secondary suite permit approvals, as follows:

1. The dwelling shall have address number clearly displayed near the front door of the main entrance; this shall include the Secondary Suite addressing.
2. The Secondary Suite shall be serviced from main service connection and shall not be serviced through a separate service connection.
3. A Secondary Suite shall not be allowed within same site that contains a Group Home, a Group Care Facility, Home Occupation Major, Garden Suite.
4. The Secondary Suite shall be operated as an Accessory Use only and shall not change the residential character of the principal dwelling involved.
5. The minimum floor area for the Secondary Suite shall not be less than 30meters squared.

6. The floor area of the Secondary Suite shall not exceed the floor area of the first story of the dwelling.

Submission of the Appellant/Applicant – Abdul Razeq

Abdul Razeq, Appellant/Applicant, provided the following:

- Will be speaking on behalf of the property owners who were unable to attend the Hearing.
- Application for Secondary Suite refused based on the number of parking stalls.
- Rear garage is existing and it is not feasible to move it to accommodate additional parking stalls on-site.
- Offered to keep one parking stall for the Primary owner and one parking stall for the Secondary Suite.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had any questions for the Appellant/Applicant.

There were no questions of the Appellant/Applicant.

Additional Speakers or Submissions

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if anyone else present wanted to speak to the appeal. There were no additional speakers.

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked the SDAB Clerk if any written submissions had been received. The SDAB Clerk confirmed that no written submissions were received.

Chair Glenn Jensen called a recess at 8:28 p.m.

Chair Glenn Jensen called the Hearing back to order at 8:34 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Development Officer.

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked the Development Officer if the use materially affects the amenities, use, value, and enjoyment of the neighbourhood.

Development Officer, Anshu Gupta, shared that as part of the application review, many factors are considered such as lot shape and size and topography. The City and Council are concerned about the impacts of on-street parking and congestion. On-street parking is not intended to act as a third parking spot for secondary suites. Street parking will have an impact on neighbours, snow clearing, etc.

Board Member, Liam McGrath, asked if the alternate approval of the Secondary Suite with conditions, offered any conditions related to parking.

Development Officer, Anshu Gupta, shared that no conditions were related to parking.

Board Member, Liam McGrath, asked to review the list of conditions for alternate approval.

Development Officer, Anshu Gupta, shared the six conditions for the Secondary Suite approval.

Board Member, Liam McGrath, confirmed that none of the conditions required a third parking stall.

Development Officer, Anshu Gupta, shared that the conditions do not include the minimum parking stalls because that is part of the requirements when considering approval.

Senior Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, shared that the city has received similar applications which led to existing garages being physically moved to accommodate additional parking stall requirements. Parking is the biggest concern in Spruce Grove; it is very important to consider this when making decisions.

Board Member, Liam McGrath, asked if the relocation of the existing garage would accommodate the third parking stall.

Senior Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, confirmed that it is an option to move the existing built garage.

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Appellant/Applicant. There were no additional questions for the Appellant/Applicant.

FINAL COMMENTS

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Development Officer had any final comments.

Anshu Gupta, Development Officer, shared there were no further comments to be made.

Final Comments from the Appellant/Applicant

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Appellant/Applicant had any final comments.

Abdul Razeq, made closing comments and stated that although the Development Officer suggested that the existing garage can be moved and other garages have been moved many times, the homeowner purchased the home with the garage already built and it is not feasible to demolish the garage and rebuild it to add additional parking.

FAIR HEARING

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the persons who made presentations felt that they had sufficient opportunity to present their evidence and arguments to the Board. All persons agreed they had sufficient opportunity to present their evidence.

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Board felt the need to recess at this time to further consider this matter. A recess was not requested.

Chair Glenn Jensen, asked if the Board was satisfied with the amount of information it had received at the hearing. The Board confirmed that they had received sufficient information.

Chair Glenn Jensen, closed the appeal hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Chair Glenn Jensen shared that a decision would be made within 15 days from the date of today's Hearing.

Dated at the City of Spruce Grove in the Province of Alberta, September 23, 2026.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY JACLYN HAGER

Jaclyn Hager, Recording Secretary
SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD