

SUMMARY

Date and Location of Hearing:	June 17, 2025 Council Chambers and Through Electronic Communications
Appellant:	Rob and Sherri Frattin
Appeal File Number:	025-STU-005
Application Number:	2025-S-009
Legal Address of Property:	Plan 8021930, Block 2, Lot 11 (Sturgeon Valley Estates)
Nature of Proposed Development:	To subdivide 0.61 hectares from 1.51 hectares

BEFORE:

Board Members: Julius Buski (Chair), Neal Comeau, Lee Danchuk, Nicole Mackoway and Amanda Papadopoulos.

Administration:

Jonathan Heemskerk, Planner, Current Planning, Planning and Development Services
Becky Williams, Manager, Legislative and Legal Services
Melodie Steele, Acting Clerk, Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

INTRODUCTION:

Chair Buski opened the hearing at 1:58 p.m.

Chair Buski introduced the SDAB members and Administration to all those present.

Chair Buski provided an overview of the SDAB process and asked if there was anyone opposed to the process. No one was opposed.

Chair Buski asked all those in attendance if there was anyone opposed to any of the Board Members hearing the appeal. There was no one opposed to the composition of the Board.

The Acting Clerk of the Board read the appeal.

SUMMARY:

Jonathan Heemskerk, Planner, Current Planning, Planning and Development Services, made a presentation on behalf of the County and provided information regarding the application (see Planning and Development Services Report).

Mr. Heemskerk provided a comparative analysis of other lots and lot sizes within the Sturgeon Valley Estates multi-lot subdivision and noted that the Appellants' proposal is not inconsistent with other existing lots. It was noted that the Subdivision Authority refused the application only because it was inconsistent with the lot-size regulations within Sturgeon County's Land Use Bylaw for the R1 – Country Residential district.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Heemskerk responded:

- There is a sustainable residential building pocket with adequate space for required setbacks on the proposed lot.
- There was one previous successful application in 1990 for lot subdivision within the multi-lot subdivision.
- There is one undeveloped lot within the multi-lot subdivision.
- Should the appeal be approved, the Subdivision Authority is recommending a condition be applied that an approved grading plan be required at the time of subdivision.

APPELLANT'S PRESENTATION:

The Appellants, Rob and Sherri Frattin, provided a verbal presentation, background information, and reasons for the appeal. To summarize:

- The Appellants currently reside in the residence on the property, while proposed lot area is unused, well maintained and currently has the appearance of an empty lot.
- They suggest the proposed subdivision provides an excellent opportunity to develop the unused portion of the property for their own residential purposes or sell to another party for residential development.
- The property is a large corner lot with established tree lines for privacy, has adequate space for the development of a new approach to the proposed lot, and would not negatively impact the enjoyment of the surrounding neighbours' properties.
- No property address changes would be required for other properties as the two resulting lots would be designated as 36A and 36B.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. and Mrs. Frattin confirmed that they agree to the proposed conditions outlined by the Subdivision Authority should the Board grant the appeal and approve the subdivision.

ADJACENT LANDOWNERS AND OTHER AFFECTED PERSONS:

Scott Wright spoke in favour of the appeal. To summarize:

- He is a landowner in the Sturgeon Valley Estates subdivision.
- He does not feel negatively impacted by the proposed subdivision and does not oppose the application.

In response a question from the Board, Mr. Heemskerk responded:

- The written submission in opposition to the proposal within the meeting agenda package was submitted by the neighbour residing on the parcel immediately to the south of the subject property.

No additional written submissions were received by other affected persons after the publication of the hearing agenda.

CLOSING COMMENTS

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

In closing, Mr. Heemskerk reiterated that the only reason the proposal was refused was that it did not conform to the minimum lot size for R1 – Country Residential district as stated in the Land Use Bylaw. He stated that from a planning perspective, this proposal does make sense when the current corner-lot parcel size, location, mature shelterbelt and consistency with other parcel sizes in the multi-lot subdivision are taken into consideration.

APPELLANT

Mr. and Mrs. Frattin declined the opportunity to provide closing comments.

Chair Buski advised that the hearing was concluded at 2:18 p.m. and that in accordance with section 687(2) of the *Municipal Government Act*, the Board will issue a decision within 15 days. No decision is binding on the Board until it issues a written decision.

THE SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
Sturgeon County



Julius Buski, Chair