

Record of Proceedings

Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Hearing

Thursday, October 2, 2025

3rd Floor - Council Chambers

315 Jespersen Ave

Spruce Grove, AB T7X 3E8

ATTENDANCE

Board Members:

Andrea Snow, Chair

Pere Bekederemo

Liam McGrath

Keith Schultz

Administration:

Gwendolyn Stewart-Palmer, SDAB Clerk

Karie Nothof, Recording Secretary

Brad McMurdo, Director of Planning and Development

Lori Kustra, Supervisor of Development

Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andrea Snow called the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing to order at 6:35 p.m.

Chair Andrea Snow provided an overview of the purpose of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Chair Andrea Snow introduced Gwendolyn Stewart-Palmer, SDAB Clerk and indicated that it is the practice of the Board to have the SDAB Clerk participate in private discussions with the Board. No objections were raised from those in attendance.

Chair Andrea Snow introduced the sitting Board Members, Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Staff, and City of Spruce Grove Administration.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Board Member Keith Schultz that the agenda for the Thursday, October 2, 2025 Subdivision and Development Appeal Board meeting be approved as presented.

Carried

APPEAL HEARING - PLDPR202500215

An appeal has been filed against the conditional approval of Development Permit PLDPR202500215 to construct to construct a Multi-Family Development at 505 Grove Drive (Plan 1522888 Block 1; Lot 4).

Appellant: Bailey MacFayden, 90 Tribute Common

Applicant: Select Engineering Consultants, 11103 - 182 Street NW, Edmonton AB

Chair Andrea Snow called upon the SDAB Clerk to introduce the subject of the appeal.

Gwendolyn Stewart-Palmer, SDAB Clerk, advised of the appeal by Bailey MacFadyen against the conditional approval of Development Permit PLDPR202500215 to construct a multi-family development at 505 Grove Drive, Plan 1522888; Block 1; Lot 4. The Development Permit Application was approved with conditions on August 29, 2025.

Chair Andrea Snow asked the SDAB Clerk if there were any preliminary matters to be addressed by the Board.

The SDAB Clerk advised the Board that there was a preliminary issue concerning whether the appeal had been filed in time. During the presentations, those speaking to the Board addressed the question of whether the appeal had been filed in time as well as the merits of the appeal.

Chair Andrea Snow asked if anyone present would like a postponement of the Hearing to a later date. A postponement was not requested.

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

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

Chair Andrea Snow 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.

The Board marked the following documents as exhibits in the hearing. Exhibits 1 - 13 were part of the Agenda package and had been submitted in advance of the Hearing. Exhibits 14 -15 were submitted during the hearing.

Submission of the Development Authority

Chair Andrea Snow 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 multi-family development at 505 Grove Drive, Block 1; Lot 4.
- The Subject Site Plan is included in the agenda package.
- The Development Permit was received for 505 Grove Drive and was conditionally approved on August 29, 2025.
- As this was a conditional approval, notification was sent out to properties within a 30m radius.
- The Development Authority indicated in its written submissions that notification of the decision was published on September 5, 2025 via the City's website.
- The *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) provides for a 21 day appeal period.
- One appeal was submitted on the approval of the multi-family development on September 18, 2025.
- The application met all regulations with regards to setbacks, height, density, site coverage, and all other regulations specific to the type of development and there were no variances. In accordance with s. 642 of the Act it was required to issue the approval with or without conditions. The Development Authority approved the development permit application without variance and subject to conditions.
- The Development Authority noted that since the development is in a Direct Control District, s. 685(4)(b) of the Act provides that any appeal is limited to "whether the development Authority followed the direction of Council as prescribed in the district."

Chair Andrea Snow asked if the Board had any questions for the Development Officer.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if Parts 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the City's Land Use Bylaw (the "LUB") (which are referenced in s. 155(2) of the LUB) were followed to make this decision?

Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, affirmed that they were followed.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if all of the side yard setbacks were followed?

Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, referred to the Site Plan Map, and shared that the setback is 7m, as noted in the location behind Building B.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, inquired if a Traffic Impact Assessment was submitted as part of this Direct Control District?

Director of Planning and Development, Brad McMurdo, provided that specific to Grove Drive, there is a broader Traffic Impact Assessment that continually gets assessed. This will include not just this development but the broader catchment area further east towards Prescott as well. As part of this development, the City's Engineering Department looked at the impact from the proposed development and determined that the access for the proposed development must be across from the access on Grove Drive. The City

monitors the impacts of increased development along Grove Drive, and determined that the need for other improvements, such as signalization or roundabouts will be required in the future beyond the 10-year horizon of the City's 10 Year Capital Plan.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Development Officer. There were no additional questions for the Development Authority.

Submission of the Appellant - Bailey MacFadyen

At the Hearing, the Appellant submitted documents as evidence for the Board; opening statement, and two written submissions were accepted and marked as Exhibits 14 and 15.

Bailey MacFadyen, Appellant, provided the following:

- She lives adjacent to this property.
- The appeal was filed on September 17, 2025 and noted that the date in the Agenda package was incorrectly noted as September 18, 2025.
- The row of trees along the property line was important to her and other area residents, particularly because of the height of the buildings. The original development plans for the property changed without warning.
- The development encroaches on the privacy and wellbeing of the residents living along the Property.
- The proposed development will create a traffic issue and a number of endangered species will be impacted.
- Concerned about the loss of privacy due to the loss of the tree line, crowding, traffic, noise, and parking in the area.
- The key issues are increased traffic and the site layout.
- Grove Drive is a busy road, and during peak hours, there will be increased traffic. The proposed development adds another access to Grove Drive without signals and shared there should be signals added.
- In reference to s. 14 of the Land Use Bylaw, the properties are affected through impacts on their privacy, and the absence of a landscaped buffer.
- There should be a requirement in the Land Use Bylaw for tree replacement and for boulevard landscaping, noting that the trees are not going to be replaced on the TELUS easement.
- The Land Use Bylaw was referenced (s. 30(1), (2) and (6)) and asked the Board to lower the height of the building.
- In reference to the City's Strategic Plan, referenced was the goal of safe, livable, and sustainable neighbourhoods and the goal of targeted investment in environmental strategies.
- Under s. 155(2), the site area is 1.5ha, so the density should be 60 units, and not 63. A reduction of three or more units would decrease the impact of the parking, which is already a concern for residents, overflow parking will go into the streets in the area.

- The parking in the proposed development does not permit a double garage, but only tandem parking. Heavy vehicles will not be able to park on the property, causing an impact to the neighbourhoods of Greystone and Tonewood.
- A preference would be to only have 53 dwellings on the property, as shown in Exhibit 14.
- There should be a reduction in the height of the buildings to 9m, which is above the 8.5m of buildings in the area.
- If the garage is on the main floor, the buildings then can be two and not three storeys.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had any questions for the Appellant.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, asked for clarification of the 60 units from the 63 units?

Bailey MacFadyen, Appellant, stated that in the LUB there is a minimum stated. The number of dwellings would be related to the amount of hectares, which 1.5ha, which would be 60 units.

Board Member, Keith Schultz, asked if the Appellant could clarify about the 53 units shown in the written submission, Exhibit 14.

Bailey MacFadyen, Appellant, shared that she clarified this in her presentation, however the less units on the site, the better.

Board Member, Keith Schultz, asked for clarification on the building height of 12m versus the 9m height.

Bailey MacFadyen, Appellant, shared that 9m is more compatible with the surrounding areas.

Board Member, Keith Schultz, requested a recess to formulate a question.

Chair Andrea Snow called a recess at 7:12 p.m.

Chair Andrea Snow called the Hearing back to order at 7:20 p.m.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, shared that issues with height, density, landscaping, and number of storeys was presented, and ask for the Appellant to help the Board understand how the Development Authority erred in its decision.

Bailey MacFadyen, Appellant, stated that the Traffic Impact Assessment was not properly done by the Development Authority. Further, the density and height, while within the bylaw, that due to the dissolution of the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board, now is the time to make changes.

Chair Andrea Snow asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Appellant. There were no additional questions for the Appellant.

Submission of the Applicant - Blaydon Dibben (on behalf of the Applicant)

Chair Andrea Snow, called upon Blaydon Dibben, Select Engineering Consultants, to provide their presentation.

Blaydon Dibben, Select Engineering Consultants, provided the Board with the following:

- He is a Planner with Select Engineering Consultants for C2 Homes, the builder.
- He worked on the 2023 Area Structure Plan for the area.
- This is a Direct Control District and the Board's jurisdiction is limited to determining whether the Development Authority followed the direction of Council.
- There were no variances and the approval complies with the Direct Control Bylaw.
- There is understanding with residents that live by new developments.
- Public open houses were held and many residents were spoken to, to explain the development and impacts on the neighbourhood.
- The proposed development is at 12m, which is lower than the previous development plans for the property, which were at 24m.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had any questions for the Applicant, Blaydon Dibben, Select Engineering Consultants.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked Blaydon Dibben, about the preliminary matter, regarding timing.

Blaydon Dibben, Select Engineering Consultants, provided that the City's website notes that payment has to be made on the same day that the appeal is filed. The payment was made September 22, 2025, and therefore that was at least four days after the appeal was filed and therefore is out of time.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, confirmed that the appeal deadline of September 18th was met, but the fee was paid on September 22nd.

Chair Andrea Snow, confirmed that this was correct.

Chair Andrea Snow asked if anyone else, other than Board Members, had questions for the Applicant. There were no additional questions for the Applicant.

Additional Parties present wishing to speak

Chair Andrea Snow asked if anyone else present wanted to speak to the appeal.

Rachel Stephen, resident beside this development shared that this appeal Hearing is a very complicated process. She has brought up multiple concerns and does not believe they have been treated properly. The Strategic Plan makes it seem like residents truly have a say, but it does not feel like they do. Tonewood is right across from Jubilee Park. People come from all over to enjoy Jubilee Park, such as Canada Day. She inquired

how residents are supposed to understand all these bylaws, legislation, and regulations with so many changes. Residents are doing their best to deal with the process. Residents need to come up with the evidence to figure out why anyone would approve this. Social media posts share inquiries about parking and traffic congestion. Residents want to have a voice. This high density structure, is an architectural disaster. The current row houses across from Jubilee Park are wonderful to look at. The Development Authority made an error in calculating the height and density. She shared that she supports Bailey MacFadyen's reason for appealing and believes that the City is catering to a developer rather than the residents.

Board Member, Keith Schultz, asked to confirm this has been ongoing situation in the neighbourhood for three years. The problems with developers, designers, and City bylaws. He also inquired if this have been taken this to Council and what the response was.

Rachel Stephens, shared that she has addressed Council and Councillor Stevenson shared that she had time to sell her property. She did contact her realtor for advice and it was shared that she has now lost a lot of value in her property. She would be happy if there was more thought put into plans of this neighbourhood, as she would love to stay in Spruce Grove.

John Carter, new resident of Spruce Grove having recently moved into the Greenbury neighbourhood. He asked about Traffic Impact Assessment as he feels that it is not complete. He shared that the proposed development is in the wrong neighbourhood and asked the Board to reconsider the development. An actual lasting difference can be made in this community, such as the creation of a commercial development, with a neighbourhood pub that residents from Tonewood or Greenbury could walk to, a bakery, or a butcher shop, things that will make a meaningful difference outside of enriching property tax dividends.

Director of Planning and Development, Brad McMurdo, shared that part of the application, is the creation of a traffic memo, and this builds off of the Traffic Impact Assessment of Grove Drive. The Traffic Impact Assessment is done, but gets updated as development continues.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, shared that this is a Direct Control District and the *Municipal Government Act* is the overarching legislation for Planning and Development. The *Municipal Government Act* is very clear on how a Board should respond to appeals when in a Direct Control District.

Chair Andrea Snow asked if anyone else present wanted to speak to the appeal. There were no additional speakers.

Chair Andrea Snow asked the SDAB Clerk if any additional written submissions had been received. The SDAB Clerk confirmed that no other written submissions were received and provided an overview of the written submissions that were received.

QUESTIONS

Chair Andrea Snow asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Development Officer.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked the Development Officer about the timing of the payment of the appeal.

Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, shared that the City Clerk's Office is responsible for applications of appeal.

The SDAB Clerk read into the record the statement from the bylaw on filing an appeal application.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, asked for clarity about the density of this multi-family development.

Development Officer, Tanya Ouellette, shared that the Development Authority approved 63 units. Section 155(2) of the Direct Control Bylaw provides that the minimum density is 40 units/net ha. The Development Authority noted that the correct area is 1.58ha. Multiplying 1.58ha by 40 u/ha results in 63 dwelling units.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Development Officer. There were no additional questions for the Development Officer.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Appellant. There were no additional questions for the Appellant.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Applicant. There were no additional questions for the Applicant.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, asked a question of clarification for Applicant about design standards pertaining to DC.15.

Blaydon Dibben, Applicant, shared that DC.15 does not speak directly to design standards. In general, there is maximum heights and setbacks. There are no other design standards within this Direct Control.

Board Member, Pere Bekederemo, asked a question of clarification for Applicant, Blaydon Dibben about the Municipal Development Plan, Area Structure Plan pertaining to a livable neighborhood.

Blaydon Dibben, Applicant, shared yes they were considered. Bushes, turning radius, parking area is safe and accessible, connected trail systems, and meeting the required setbacks. The row house buildings are 22 feet wide and by today's standards are quite a wide building. The balconies meet the setbacks of 7m from the property line, and from

the balcony to the building are quite wide. This meets the 12m maximum height, and meets the minimum requirements of density, as a reminder this development could be 110 units. Two accesses were tried for, however only one access was given.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for the Applicant. There were no additional questions for the Applicant.

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Board had further questions for clarification for any other person. There were no additional questions.

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

FINAL COMMENTS

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Development Officer had any final comments.

Tanya Ouellette, Development Officer, shared there were no further comments to be made.

Chair Andrea Snow, 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

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Applicant had any final comments. There were no further comments from the Applicant.

Final Comments from the Appellant

Chair Andrea Snow, asked if the Appellant had any final comments.

Bailey MacFadyen, made closing comments and stated that the proposed development does not align with the intent of the Land Use Bylaw in safety, the character of the neighbourhood or the livability of the neighbourhood. She feels there are hazards as a result of the access, and the loss of the tree line harms neighbours. She feels the design elements, like massing and height are not appropriate. The parking and density do not work and will spill over into neighbouring areas. She wants a decrease in the density of the proposed development.

FAIR HEARING

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

Chair Andrea Snow, 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 Andrea Snow, closed the appeal hearing at 8 p.m.

Chair Andrea Snow 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, October 2, 2025.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY KARIE NOTHOF

Karie Nothof, Recording Secretary
SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD