

high with the same metal material exterior and coloring as the existing building. The cold storage addition would have a gravel base.

Discussion ensued with regard to the construction of the addition.

b. PRESENTATION OF DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

Development Officer confirmed receipt of the application for a cold storage addition with a variance to the rear setback to 1.5 m. The proposal is beyond her authority or the approving authority of the Municipal Planning Commission and therefore the development permit was refused. She confirmed that the zoning is M-1 (Light Industrial District). Further that the area adjacent is industrial in nature.

c. PRESENTATION OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

No one was in attendance. No concerns were received.

d. PRESENTATION OF PLANNING CONSULTANT

Planning Consultant commented that the site is large and the existing building footprint is small leaving a large building envelope. Other building options and configurations could be considered. He noted the proposal does not include accessing the property from the lane and this is a positive point. Otherwise he would have concerns with egress.

Planning Consultant confirmed that the zoning is M-1 (Light Industrial) and that the Land Use Bylaw stipulates a minimum rear setback of 7.5 m. He commented that while the proposed 1.5 m setback does not necessarily negatively impact the adjacent parcels, he expressed some concern with the laneway and access as well as potential conflict with the parcel to the north.

It was his opinion that there was plenty of building envelope to accommodate a storage unit without relaxing the rear setback and recommended that the setback be adhered to. However, he indicated that if the Board feels that a relaxation of the rear setback is warranted, he would suggest a 5 m setback which would be consistent with the surrounding properties. Further he would suggest attaching two conditions:

1. No man or vehicle access to the rear of the building.
2. Retain fencing along rear of property in its entirety to ensure no encroachment.

e. PRESENTATION OF ANYONE SERVED NOTICE OF HEARING

No one was in attendance.

f. PRESENTATION OF ANYONE CLAIMING TO BE AFFECTED

No one was in attendance.

g. REBUTTAL OF APPLICANT

B. Lecuyer advised that to place the cold storage anywhere else would not be beneficial as they want to use a forklift to move materials and need a large turning radius. He indicated that material come in various lengths dependent on what the customer is wanting. He suggested that a lock be placed on the gate at the rear which would be accessible to the fire department for emergency purposes.

He noted that some benefits to the development would be the increased taxes and will assist with maintaining the lot better.

Discussion ensued with regard to the construction of the addition. Mr. Lecuyer was asked if he had a Real Property Report. No real property report was available.

h. OTHER
No further comments.

i. RECESS
P. Monteith moved the Board to recess at 7:27 p.m.. and the Board met in camera to discuss the situation.

Planning Consultant, Development Officer, B. Lecuyer, E. Larsen, left the room at 7:27 p.m.

j. DECISION
G. Shipley moved that the appeal against the decision of the Development Officer, to refuse to issue a permit for a cold storage addition with a relaxed rear setback to 1.5 m, be upheld and that the decision of the Development Officer be revoked and a development permit be issued approving the cold storage addition with a relaxed rear setback of 5 m with the following conditions:

1. No access allowed on the north wall of the cold storage addition.
2. Fencing along the rear property line is to be maintained.

- Carried.

Further the Board advised the reasons for its decision is there is adequate on-site parking and relaxation of rear setback to 5m from 7.5m is in character with the surrounding adjacent industrial uses.

The Board reconvened at 8:51 p.m.

Planning Consultant, Development Officer, Appellants, rejoined the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Chairman Lutz advised the applicant of the Boards decision and further advised that a letter stating the decision of the Board would be forthcoming.

4. ADJOURNMENT
G. Shipley moved the meeting be adjourned at 8:52 p.m.