



October 8, 2025

Town of Grand Valley  
5 Main Street  
Grand Valley, ON  
L9W 5S6

Attention: Mark Kluge, MCIP, RPP  
Town Planner

RE: 50 Emma St, Grand Valley  
Site Plan Application File SPA01-2025

---

Dear Mr. Kluge,

In January 2025, Sheldon Creek Developments Inc. submitted a site plan application for a 24-unit, 5-storey condominium development at 50 Emma Street, Grand Valley, Town of Grand Valley file SPA01-2025, along with a new zoning application, file Z01-2025. Since that time, the zoning for the 18-unit, 4-storey condominium has been approved by Council, through Town of Grand Valley file Z05-2023 previously submitted. To supplement the site plan application, we submit the site works and servicing cost estimate with this letter. These costs are now covered by fewer units putting financial pressure on the project.

We write formally to you to request the following with respect to the Development Charges for our proposed development at 50 Emma Street, Grand Valley:

1. A reduction to the Development Charges equal to \$271,850.91 or 75% of the costs of the storm sewer and road improvements to Emma Street, and
2. To defer payment of the Development Charges to Occupancy Permit

Below is set out the rationale for our proposal, and we respectfully request your favourable consideration.

It has been well published that there is an affordability and housing crisis in Ontario and across Canada. In 2022, the government of Ontario set a target of 1.5 million homes to be built across the province by 2031. This target was set with improving affordability in mind. Now, in fact, some say that the 2.1 million homes could be needed to improve affordability (Jeffords, 2025). Meanwhile, we are not on track to meet the initial target. Housing starts in 2024 was about 95,000 (Jones, 2025) and in the first half of 2025, construction began on only 27,000 units (Fuss, 2025).

The current economic conditions have contributed to reducing builder confidence, and a factor of our inability to meet the housing target, but costs to build are also a major challenge. According to the Canadian Centre for Economic Analysis, the total government fees on a new home in Ontario is approximately 36% of the final purchase price in Ontario (Canadian Centre for Economic Analysis, 2024). This is significant and there is room for improvement here. Last year, the Town increased their development charges by 131% on 2-bedroom apartments from \$21,405.00 to \$49,536.00 per unit, and by 70% on 1-bedroom apartments from \$14,485 to \$24,621.00. When we began evaluating the condominium concept for this site, our Town of Grand Valley DCs (excluding the County and Education charges) would have been \$364,530.00. With the Town of Grand Valley development charges now \$51,489.00 for a two-bedroom apartment and \$25,592.00 for a one-bedroom apartment, the Town of Grand Valley portion of DCs has skyrocketed to \$849,111.00, a total increase of \$484,581.00 (or 133%). In a time when building is to be encouraged, raising costs like this is not the solution.

Furthermore, as mentioned in the introduction, earlier this year we had submitted an application to add one more storey to the building, to allow us to build 24 units total. When a councillor suggested at the Council meeting in early October 2024 the possibility of adding the additional storey, there was no indications from others that there were any reservations about this approach. Given the general support from Council up to that point in the process, we

initiated the process to complete the required studies, namely a parking justification report. The parking study recommended that 1.50 parking spaces per unit be applied to our project (Dollano, 2024). With 24 residential units and 38 parking spaces, or 1.58 parking spaces per unit, we achieved that ratio. To supplement our application, we even completed a shadow study analysis to show that the taller building would not impose any objectionable shadow on neighbouring properties. With the investigation into the additional storey providing support for the same, we were shocked when council was not supportive of the change to the project at the public meeting in late February 2025. As we deliberated internally, the Town's Engineer reported to council that they essentially would not recommend further developments until the Town's wastewater issue has been resolved, further complicating the matter. After due consideration, we decided to proceed with the 18-unit building in May 2025. Overall, this process significantly delayed the project by a minimum of 6 months. All the while, we are incurring additional study fees, additional financing charges, as well as see the development charges increase once again this past summer as discussed above.

As such, we are looking for relief on development charges. We like to point out that the Development Charges Act, Paragraph 2, indicates that municipalities *may* impose development charges, and as such it is not a requirement. While we are not expecting zero development charges, we are looking for reconsideration of what is being charged.

Under section 38 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, a municipality may grant credits to an owner for the provision of works (or costs thereof) that are eligible under the DC regime (i.e. capital costs for services for which development charges may be imposed). The Act contemplates that a developer who constructs or finances infrastructure that would otherwise be the municipality's responsibility can receive compensation (credit) to avoid "double payment." (Development Charges Act, s. 38). Further, according to the Town of Grand Valley's Development Charges By-Law No 2024-33, Paragraph 4.1 "*Despite the payment required under subsections 3.8 and 3.9, Council may, by agreement, give a credit towards a development charge in exchange for work that relates to a service to which a development charge relates under this by-law.*" We acknowledge that local roadworks are often excluded from development charge

calculations, as they are generally considered a developer's direct responsibility and local service. However, the basis for such an argument is that the local service benefits solely the specific development rather than the broader community. In this manner, infill projects such as ours should be evaluated differently than tract building. Our development is located on an existing road that is the municipality's responsibility to maintain. Reconstruction of the roadway almost in its entirety, including road widening, new curbs and sidewalks, as well as a new storm sewer for the road, certainly benefits the existing neighbouring community in addition to the future residents at our development.

At some point, regardless of our development, Emma St would need to be reconstructed or repaired as the Town seeks to either urbanize its downtown streets or the existing road is worn out and needs repair. Consider the significant increase in tax revenue to be generated from this site post development to contribute to such expenditures. Not only would those road costs not need to be incurred by the Town for a longer period of time, but at present, those taxes will not need to be allocated toward repairing the road, thereby allowing the Town to allocate those funds elsewhere.

Briefly on the point of deferring Development Charges payment to Occupancy Permit. While not reflected in the Town's Development Charges by-law, Bill 17, Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025, amends the Development Charges Act section 26.1 to permit payment at the time the occupancy permit is issued. In structuring payment this way, there are significant financial interest savings in not having to carry the development charges cost for the duration of the project and we request that this be implemented for our development.

As our planner has described in their Planning Justification Report, condominiums and apartments are underrepresented in Grand Valley (Lewington, 2025). This investment of a relatively modest sum, by the community, for the community, is one way in which we, together, can bring this housing option to the Town of Grand Valley. In a time when we are experiencing a housing and affordability crisis, municipal partnership is important to bring projects to

completion. We thank-you for considering a partnership with Sheldon Creek Developments in the completion of this project and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Respectfully submitted,



Willem Wildeboer  
Project Manager  
Sheldon Creek Developments Inc



Andrew Wildeboer  
President  
Sheldon Creek Developments Inc.

## References

- Jeffords, S. (2025, June 23). Ontario needs to build more than 2 million homes in the next decade: internal docs. *CBC News*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/ontario-housing-needs-1.1234567>
- Jones, A (2025, Aug 11). Ontario records low housing starts, even with new ways of counting them. *CBC News*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ontario-housing-starts-ford-goal-1.7605677>
- Fuss, J et al. (2025, July 25). Ontario's housing mess bad news for Canadians across the country. *Fraser Institute*. <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/commentary/ontarios-housing-mess-bad-news-canadians-across-country#:~:text=In%20the%20first%20six%20months,poor%20performance%20is%20especially%20consequential>
- Canadian Centre for Economic Analysis. (2024). The increasing tax burden on new Ontario homes. Retrieved October 8, 2025, from <https://www.cancea.ca/index.php/2024/12/03/the-increasing-tax-burden-on-new-ontario-homes-2024/>
- Dollano, T (2024). *50 Emma Street Grand Valley Parking Justification Study*. (2024-142). CGH Transportation
- Lewington, C. (2025). Planning Justification Addendum Letter. GSP Group Inc