

Record of Proceedings

Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Hearing
Wednesday, July 16, 2025
3rd Floor - Council Chambers
315 Jespersen Ave
Spruce Grove, AB T7X 3E8

ATTENDANCE

Board Members:

Glenn Jensen, Chair
Liam McGrath
Tim Ormsbee
Keith Schultz

Administration:

Lindsay O'Mara, SDAB Clerk
Laura Hall, Deputy City Clerk
Nicole Hitchens, Recording Secretary
Lori Kustra, Supervisor of Development
Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Glenn Jensen called the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing to order at 6:33 p.m.

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

Chair Glenn Jensen introduced Lindsay O'Mara, SDAB Clerk and Laura Hall, Deputy City Clerk who is attending for training purposes. Chair Glenn Jensen 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 introduced the sitting Board Members, Subdivision and Development Appeal Board staff, and City of Spruce Grove staff.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Board Member Tim Ormsbee that the agenda for the Wednesday, July 16, 2025 Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be approved as presented.

Carried

APPEAL HEARING - PLDPR202500656

An appeal has been filed against the conditional approval of Development Permit PLDPR202500656 to construct a secondary suite at 100 Hemingway Crescent (Plan 22221877 Block 14 Lot 72).

Appellants: Dean Sikorski, 94 Hemingway Crescent
Marina Sikorski, 94 Hemingway Crescent
[REDACTED], [REDACTED]
Scott Stuckless, 96 Hemingway Crescent
Robyn Stuckless, 96 Hemingway Crescent
Perry Berdeknis, 86 Hemingway Crescent
Lauren Jay Payne, 86 Hemingway Crescent

Applicants: Homexx Corporation, 11103 - 182 Street NW, Edmonton AB

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

Lindsay O'Mara, SDAB Clerk, advised of the appeal by Dean Sikorski against the conditional approval of Development Permit PLDPR202500656 to construct a secondary suite at 100 Hemingway Crescent (Plan 22221877 Block 14 Lot 72). The Development Permit Application was approved with conditions on June 2, 2025.

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.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone present would like a postponement of the Hearing to a later date. No postponement was requested.

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 asked if there were any additional written submissions from anyone present. One additional submission was provided by the Appellant.

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 were raised by those present.

Submission of the Development Authority

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

Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer, read the Development Officer's Report into the record and provided the following:

- This development permit was to construct a secondary suite in the basement of an existing single detached dwelling.
- The address is 100 Hemingway Crescent.
- The Subject Site Plan is in the agenda package.
- Section 7 of the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) C-824-12 defines a Secondary Suite.
- Section 75 of the LUB C-824-12 regulates a Secondary Suite.
- The Development Permit was received for 100 Hemingway Crescent and was conditionally approved on June 2, 2025.
- All regulations appeared to be met.
- As this was a conditional approval, notification was sent out to properties within a 30m radius.
- One appeal was submitted on the approval of a Secondary Suite on June 20, 2025.

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

Tim Ormsbee, Board Member, asked what qualifies as a parking stall for a dwelling. Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, provided the dimensions and requirements for parking stalls and said the development permit includes more parking stalls than required for the dwelling and secondary suite.

Tim Ormsbee, Board Member, asked if there are parking regulations for suites. Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, responded that there is not.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Development Officer.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, asked if there is a limit to the number of secondary suites allowed in a subdivision. Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer, responded that there is not.

Submission of the Appellants

At the hearing, the Appellant submitted documents as evidence for the Board; opening statement, response to the homeowners' letter, challenging assumptions, photos showing homes with secondary suites and a copy of the original appeal letter. These documents were not part of the Agenda Package. These documents were accepted and marked as Exhibit 11 and were distributed to the other affected parties.

Chair Glenn Jensen called upon the representatives of the Appellants, Dean Sikorski and Scott Stuckless, to provide their presentation.

Dean Sikorski and Scott Stuckless provided the Board with the following:

- The appeal isn't about a single application but a pattern of development that is reshaping how streets function and how liveable and safe the community remains.
- Parking is a concern as garages are regularly used for other uses (storage, workspaces) rather than to park vehicles, so driveways and curbside parking becomes the solution.
- Development permits are evaluated in isolation so the cumulative effects can overwhelm infrastructure on streets.
- The proximity of Copperhaven Elementary School draws additional congestion as the path to the school on Hemingway Crescent is used for school pick-up and drop-off.
- City guidelines are not realistic as existing neighbourhoods now reflect a very different reality.
- There are safety concerns due to obstructed sidewalks, reduced driver visibility, and delayed emergency access in school zones and high pedestrian corridors.
- Builders, such as Homexx, actively market secondary suites as a building option and mortgage helper.
- A verbal response, in response to the Homeowners letter that was provided in the agenda package.

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

Keith Schultz, Board Member, asked the Appellants where the path to the school was located. Dean Sikorski responded that the path is between 86 and 88 Hemingway Crescent. He said that parents park on the street to walk their children to school or to pick-up or drop-off their children, making it difficult to drive by at certain times of day.

Keith Schultz, Board Member, asked the Appellants if they have witnessed a situation where emergency vehicles have been unable to get through the neighbourhood due to congestion. The Appellants responded that they have not witnessed emergency vehicles being unable to get through but, on garbage pick-up days, the road can reduce to one lane due to the garbage trucks.

Keith Schultz, Board Member, asked the Appellants how many times they have brought forward an appeal to the SDAB. Dean Sikorski and Scott Stuckless both responded that this was the first time either of them has submitted an appeal.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, said the community's biggest attraction was the high value area for buyers but there is so much congestion now.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, claimed that the Homeowner's letter provided inaccurate statements. When asked by Josh Jentink, Homeowner's Representative, what was inaccurate in the letter, the Appellant responded that it is a high-traffic area and, without residing in the area, people cannot fully understand the magnitude of the increased traffic.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Appellants. There were no additional questions for the Appellants.

Submission of the Applicant

Chair Glenn Jensen called upon Josh Jentink, Homeowner's Representative, to provide their presentation.

Josh Jentink and Emilee Jentink, Homeowner's Representatives, provided the Board with the following:

- The dimensions of the oversized garage.
- That there will be four parking stalls which is more than what is required for the dwelling and secondary suite.
- That street parking could be a short-term issue for temporary parking needs as residents settle into new homes.
- The homeowners will not rely on street parking as garage parking is a necessity for them, especially in winter.
- The suite is for family needs (not a rental) and will have minimal impact on the neighbourhood.
- Thanked Planning and Development for their assistance to ensure all development requirements were met.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had any questions for the Homeowner's Representative.

Keith Shultz, Board Member, asked the Homeowner's Representative how many cars will be at the dwelling. Josh Jentink, Homeowner's Representative, responded that there will be three vehicles and two will park in the oversized garage.

Emilee Jentink, Homeowner's Representative, shared that this multigenerational development is about wanting to solve their family's long-term problems related to aging parents. This was a way to solve many issues - to be close and to assist their aging parents.

Chair Glenn Jensen called upon the Applicant, Cory Ahlskog of Homexx Corporation, to provide their presentation.

Cory Ahlskog, Applicant, provided the Board with the following:

- In response to the Appellant's comment that Homexx actively focuses on secondary suites, this is only the second application for a secondary suite in the last two phases in Harvest Ridge. Overall, in the past ten years, there's been a small percentage of applications for secondary suites.
- In response to the Appellant's comments about street parking issues and garages being used for hobby areas, it is a slippery slope when current residents, including an Appellant, have children who will become drivers with vehicles.

- There are lots of multi-generation homes that exist in the community. The only reason this appeal has come forward is because it is being built with a legal suite.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Applicant or Homeowner's Representative. There were no additional questions for the Applicant or Homeowner's Representative.

Additional Parties present wishing to speak

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, other than the one additional submission provided by the Appellant, no other written submissions were received.

Chair Glenn Jensen called a recess at 7:21 p.m.

Chair Glenn Jensen reconvened the hearing at 7:31 p.m.

QUESTIONS

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

Timothy Ormsbee, Board Member, asked the Development Officer if the properties that include two municipal numbers on the plot plan indicate secondary suites. Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer responded that corner lots always have two addresses depending on the orientation of the house but the properties noted with the letter "A" include a secondary suite.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked the Development Officer if there is any consideration of emergency vehicles when it comes to the development of streets (e.g. street width). Tanya Ouellette responded that, when neighbourhoods are built out, Protective Services and Engineering have a role in reviewing development permits and providing their observations for traffic and parking.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked the Development Officer if the City works with the School Districts to discuss different pick-up locations for their students. Lori Kustra, Supervisor of Development, responded that, when a subdivision is approved, all roads must meet municipal standards for fire and emergency vehicles. When it comes to parents parking or dropping off their children, the City has no control over that. But, if parents are blocking driveways, Enforcement Services can be contacted to investigate the concerns.

Liam McGrath, Board Member, asked the Development Officers, if part of the subdivision approval is traffic modelling or assumptions for worst case scenario of many additional suites. Lori Kustra, Supervisor of Development said she was unable to answer that as it would fall under Engineering.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Development Officer. There were no additional questions for the Development Officer.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Appellants. There were no additional questions for the Appellants.

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

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for any other person. There were no additional questions.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if anyone who presented had questions for clarification of any other presenter. There were no additional questions for any presenters.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, asked the Applicant, Cory Ahlskog of Homexx Corporation, how many homes Homexx has built in previous years with secondary homes, and how many homes were built in previous years with secondary homes in a row.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, then told the Applicant, Cory Ahlskog of Homexx Corporation, that he didn't need to respond to his next comments but shared his family is low income so his children will not have their own cars when they reach the age that they can drive.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, asked the Development Officer if there is consideration of more secondary suites in new builds being developed. Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer responded that, as this is an R1 District, there could be more applications for secondary suites in single detached dwellings but secondary suites are not a use in semi-detached dwellings (that are in an R1 District).

In response to prior questions made by Scott Stuckless, Appellant, the Applicant, Cory Ahlskog of Homexx Corporation, provided the Board with the following:

- Outlined his personal parking habits and said he doesn't understand why this development permit is a concern when there is ample parking.
- That he's been building homes for ten years in Harvest Ridge (approximately 70 - 80 homes) and there has been approximately eight basement suites.
- That Homexx does not push secondary suites.
- That the road is nine metres wide and doesn't understand the concern of traffic flow. He further indicated that parking issues are a challenge everywhere giving the example of Spruce Grove and Edmonton.
- That, when he's driven through the area, he has not experienced significant congestion but, when he has, it's the builders/developers and construction crews that are the issue.

Scott Stuckless, Appellant, wanted to clarify that the intention of the appeal is not personal to the homeowner of 100 Hemingway Crescent. He is not against generational living but expressed that residing in the area and observing what is occurring with increased traffic

and vehicle and pedestrian safety in the area, is concerning. Allowing an unlimited number of secondary suites compounds the issues.

FINAL COMMENTS

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

Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer, shared that the concerns raised are not within the scope of the Land Use Bylaw regulations. If there are concerns with the regulations, the Land Use Bylaw is undergoing a complete re-write in 2026 and shared that the City will be welcoming input from residents as part of the review.

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if any one present who made a presentation had any final comments. There were no further comments from those who made a presentation.

Final Comments from the Applicant and Homeowner's Representative

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Applicant had any final comments. There were no further comments from the Applicant and Homeowner's Representative.

Final Comments from the Appellants

Chair Glenn Jensen asked if the Appellants had any final comments. There were no further comments from the Appellants.

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 the Board if it was satisfied with the amount of information it had received at the meeting. The Board confirmed that they had received sufficient information.

Chair Glenn Jensen closed the appeal hearing at 7:48 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, July 16, 2025

Nicole Hitchens, Recording Secretary
SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD