



is typical to ask that the site or portions of the site be paved. She commented that she did not feel she had the expertise to determine the extent of the paving and thus required the entire site to be paved.

Development Officer noted that the permit applies to both parcels described as Lot 1, Block 3, Plan 5860JK & Lot 4, Block 3, Plan 9110672. However when the permit was issued the second legal description of Lot 4, Block 3, Plan 9110672 was omitted. She also commented that when the application was initially reviewed there was consideration to impose a condition of consolidation but because no structure was crossing a property line she decided not to. However, in hindsight because the site drainage plan applies to both parcels consolidation should be required and recommends this condition be added.

c. **PRESENTATION OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN**

No one in attendance.

Note: this application was not presented to the Commission for consideration as it falls under the permitted use category.

d. **PRESENTATION OF PLANNING CONSULTANT**

K. Snyder, Planning Consultant advised the Board he has a couple suggestions to make regarding the application. He commented that whenever an application is presented to the Board that it should be looked at with fresh eyes. He indicated he has viewed this application in this manner and is presenting additional issues that the board should consider.

Regarding the condition for paving, Planning Consultant indicated that traditionally it has been a requirement for commercial and industrial uses, but that for the most part it has been applied to the front yards and not so much the entire site or in the rear yards. He commented that rear yards would typically be left gravel. The purposes of the requirement for paving is to reduce dust, gravel, to protect the Town's infrastructure and give an orderly appearance to the streetscape. Thus he felt that the amount of paving required could be reduced.

Planning Consultant indicated his primary concern is with the access proposed on Mitchell Street. The application shows a 136 m continuous driveway access onto Mitchell Street. Mitchell Street is a principle roadway into the Town. While traffic may be insignificant at this time it is expected that in the future, as the Town grows with residential in Eastside and commercial / industrial in the north, that this would be a main connector between the two growth areas over the next 25 years. This road could become very busy in the future and it is expected that the entire roadway will be needed for road operation.

Planning Consultant also expressed concern with the driveway being in such close proximity to the Broadway and Mitchell intersection. He commented that this does not meet industry standards.

According to the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Manual it states that industrial driveways should be limited to a maximum of 15 m wide. Clarifying

that this is only a guideline and there could be deviation but commented that he feels the proposal is too much.

He also commented that Mitchell Street is a main road from the highway and should be presentable and felt that a 130 m driveway is not a nice gateway into town.

Planning Consultant also expressed concern that some of the maneuvering of truck traffic occurs off of the property and onto the public roadway, which could be a concern in the future with safety and functionality of the roadway. Again he expressed concern with the width of the proposed driveway.

He commented the site is large enough to accommodate the proposal in terms of scale of property and there isn't an issue with density or intensity, but the driveway will create ongoing long term operational concerns for the Town.

He also mentioned that he is under the understanding that the Town is or has an agreement with the property owner regarding access. He had no specific comments or advice regarding the agreement but noted that his interpretation of Section 680 Municipal Government Act is that the SDAB is not bound by previous agreements.

The Planning Consultant clarified he has some recommendations and is providing them from a planning / land use bylaw view point.

The SDAB has the authority to overturn the decision, alter the decision, add conditions or uphold the condition. He suggested that the paving condition be varied to reduce the amount of paving required to high profile areas against the public roads and on the main driveways on the site. Further suggesting, adding the condition of consolidation of the two parcels. He also suggested that the Board be sensitive to existing site structure and operation and investment that has been made previously and balance that with the opportunity to further reduce road safety and functionality concerns in the future. He suggested that a condition be placed which would specify that all truck maneuvering be concluded on site and does not extend into public roadway. Further that the driveway be reduced to two 15 – 20 m width accesses.

**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**

Mr. McNally expressed confusion as to why other issues and concerns were being discussed. He was under the impression that the only issue to discuss is the quantity of pavement and not to redesign the project. He empathized with the concerns of having so much driveway access on Mitchell Street, but stated it is to facilitate with keeping the trucks off of Mitchell Street and allowing them

adequate room to pull in and back up. He suggested that it could be reduced on the south end somewhat but felt the suggestion from the Planning Consultant would make it very difficult for getting the trucks in there.

h. **OTHER**

Discussion ensued with regard to the application. B. Hawrelak had several questions relating to consolidation, Mitchell Street access, Broadway access, and frontage. Discussion ensued with regard to the aesthetics of the site.

R. Wagenaar assured the Board that the Red Hat Cooperative Ltd. interest is similar to the Town's in that they want to see the site paved, with the exception of the back portion, but they need time. He commented that the expansion is sizeable and time will be needed to allow for settlement.

D. Kilpatrick advised the application is not a simple approval. He expressed concern that the existing building is too close to Mitchell Street, concern with damage to the Town's infrastructure from mud and gravel being tracked onto the roadway and concern with traffic flows in the future. He suggested that the access on Mitchell Street be reduced to two accesses of 30 m each with an island between. Discussion ensued.

Regarding questions as to whether the SDAB is permitted to look at the entire application versus just the condition that was appealed, the Planning Consultant clarified to Mr. McNally that the SDAB must review the application fresh and is not bound by any past decisions. Provincial legislation extends the authority to SDAB's to impose all kinds of rules.

Discussion ensued with the design of the Mitchell Street access. Mr. McNally commented that two 40 m access points may work.

The Board briefly contemplated tabling the application to allow a new design to be submitted. P. McNally and R. Wagenaar expressed concern with any delays to timeline as they are already tight for time on this project and preferred to reach some type of agreement.

i. **RECESS**

V. Lutz moved the Board to recess at 7:54 p.m. and the Board met in camera.

Planning Consultant, Development Officer, Manager of Engineering, P. McNally, R. Wagenaar left the room at 7:54 p.m.

j. **DECISION**

G. Shipley moved that the appeal against the decision of the Development Officer, to issue a permit for "expansion to processing & cold storage facilities and new staff preparation and lunch area" with the following conditions:

1. The proposed setbacks and location of the addition are approved as per the submitted Site Layout.
2. The location and number of the parking stalls is approved as per the Site Layout; however, as indicated in Section 52(5)(g) & (h), all on-site parking/loading spaces, manoeuvring aisles and driveways shall be surfaced within 12 months from completion of the development and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Development Officer. The parking spaces and manoeuvring aisles shall be identified by pavement markings to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.
3. The access from the parcel onto Broadway Avenue shall be used for exiting only for semi-truck/trailer units.
4. Landscaping shall be completed as indicated on the Site Layout.
5. The storage area indicated on the Site Layout shall be fenced, secured, screened and comply with the Alberta Fire Code.
6. The Facia Sign is approved as indicated on the submitted Elevations.

be upheld and that the decision of the Development Officer be varied and a development permit for Red Hat Cooperative Ltd. on Lot 1. Block 3, Plan 5860JK & Lot 4, Block 3, Plan 9110672 (809 Broadway Avenue East) for a Expansion to processing & cold storage facilities and new staff preparation and lunch area be approved with the following conditions:

1. The proposed setbacks and location of the addition are approved as per the submitted Site Layout.
2. The location and number of the parking stalls is approved as per the Site Layout; however, as indicated in Section 52(5)(g) & (h).
3. Access off Mitchell Street shall be limited to two (2) 30 m accesses separated by an island/boulevard. The accesses shall be constructed at a minimum of 30 m from the south property line. The island/boulevard shall be constructed with perimeter curbing and gutter and be landscaped.
4. The manoeuvring and loading dock areas on the west side of the building shall be hard surfaced.
5. The Broadway access shall be hard surfaced for a distance of 20m from property line into the property and blended to meet pavement on Broadway Avenue.
6. Hard surfacing shall be completed within 24 months of occupancy.
7. The access from the parcel onto Broadway Avenue shall be used for exiting only for semi-truck/trailer units.
8. Landscaping shall be completed as indicated on the Site Layout.

9. The storage area indicated on the Site Layout shall be fenced, secured, screened and comply with the Alberta Fire Code.
10. The Facia Sign is approved as indicated on the submitted Elevations.
11. Consolidation of Lot 1, Block 3, Plan 5860JK and Lot 4, Block 3, Plan 9110672  
- Carried.

The Board advised the reasons for its decision is that Mitchell Street is a primary roadway and access to the Town of Redcliff and should be aesthetically pleasing. Further that gravel migration onto the roadways should be limited to protect Town infrastructure. Consolidation is required as one of the access points is via Lot 4 Block 3, Plan 9110672 and the site drainage plan includes both parcels.

The Board reconvened at 8:40 p.m.

Planning Consultant, Development Officer, Manager of Engineering, P. McNally, R. Wagenaar rejoined the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Chairman Kilpatrick advised the applicant of the Board's decision and further advised that a letter stating the decision of the Board would be forthcoming.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

V. Lutz moved the meeting be adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



\_\_\_\_\_  
D. Kilpatrick, Chairman



\_\_\_\_\_  
S. Simon, Recording Secretary