

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SUBDIVISION
AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.**

PRESENT: Members: B. Hawrelak, D. Kilpatrick, V. Lutz,
P. Monteith, G. Shipley, C. Crozier

Development Officer	B. Stehr
Planning Consultant	K. Snyder
Manager of Engineering	K. Minhas
Recording Secretary	S. Simon
Municipal Planning Commission	Wm. Duncan
Appellant	M. Prevost
Supernal Homes	Greg Funk
Other	C. Brown
	S. Clewlow

1. CALL TO ORDER

Recording Secretary called the appeal hearing to order at 7:00 p.m., confirmed there was a quorum present to hear these appeals; and opened nominations for Chairman.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

P. Monteith nominated D. Kilpatrick to be Chairman, seconded by G. Shipley. D. Kilpatrick accepted and assumed control of the appeal hearing.

3. APPEAL NO. 1

**Appeal of Development Application 14-DP-013
Lot 43, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (326 Broadway Avenue W)
Semi-Detached Housing Development**

Chairman Kilpatrick asked the appellant if they had any objection to any board members hearing the appeal. M. Prevost advised she had no objection to any member of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

a) Presentation of Appellant

M. Prevost referenced the appeal information she had provided and questioned if everyone had read her information. The Chairman confirmed that M. Prevost's submission had been included in their package.

M. Prevost referenced Section 617 of the Municipal Government Act which states:

617 The purpose of this Part and the regulations and bylaws under this Part is to provide means whereby plans and related matters may be prepared and adopted

- a) to achieve the orderly, economical and beneficial development, use of land and patterns of human settlement, and

- b) to maintain and improve the quality of the physical environment within which patterns of human settlement are situated in Alberta,

without infringing on the rights of individuals for any public interest except to the extent that is necessary for the overall greater public interest.

M. Prevost commented that subsequent to seeing the notice in the paper on March 11 that development had been approved for 5 semi-detached dwellings, which results in 10 homes, that she was concerned with sewer backups and how much additional sewer would be generated to flow into the system and which area would be affected.

She indicated that she had several conversations with the Development Officer regarding setbacks, offsite levies and sanitary flow direction. She commented that the Development Officer was reluctant to answer some questions about setbacks and wanted to speak with Shanon Simon, Manager of Legislative and Land Services.

She advised that she later picked up a draft copy of the MPC minutes. Further she commented that the Development Officer advised her that Ms. Simon had confirmed that the development before the SDAB had met the setback according to the Land Use Bylaw 1698/2011 for R1 subdivision and that cantilevers may project into the sideyard but must maintain a minimum of 1.2 m separation from property line. Further that 1.5 m was within setback requirements.

M. Prevost referenced the report prepared by the Development Officer where it notes that the development does not meet the setback requirement and therefore should not have been approved at the February 19 meeting according to Sec 100(d)(3) of the Land Use Bylaw which states one unobstructed 3m setback where there is no lane is required.

M. Prevost advised the development applications were reviewed by a team of 5 members on the MPC and as result of recommendations of the Engineers, Planning Consultant and Development Officer these applications were approved. She notes that the Development Officer admitted that for this appeal part of the development bylaw was overlooked. M. Prevost commented this is a gross understatement because it was reviewed by 5 members of the MPC, well paid professionals either employed by or contracted to the Town of Redcliff.

M. Prevost further advised that this subdivision is zoned R1, and having consecutive lots with semi-detached dwellings constitutes medium density R2. Semi-detached dwellings in a R1 zone is a discretionary use and means the odd development of semi-detached is allowed not a semi-detached dwelling on every lot.

M. Prevost commented that she felt the actions and misguided opinion and the grossly understated oversight regarding this content and conforming to the Land Use bylaw 1698/2011 has brought us here today. That the rights as individuals have been infringed upon as a result of misguidance and misinformation which has cost a great deal of money, time and undue stress on myself and landowners of these properties.

M. Prevost commented that she also feels she was also misguided on the direction of flow for sewer for this development and will thus only refer to lift station no. 3 at 3rd Ave and 3rd St. NW. She commented that everyone she has spoken too and everything she has read about lift no. 3 has clearly indicated that lift no. 3 has never worked correctly

and that the area is in trouble. She feels this should of been investigated before the warranty expired.

M. Prevost referenced different pages in the MPE report which identify problem areas and noted that no repairs or resolutions were or are being implemented prior to allowing further development to occur. Further that any proposed solutions going forward are only hearsay that anything will be done.

M. Prevost noted there is a recommendation to the SDAB that these developments go forward even though medium density development has never been considered for subdivisions zoned R1. Noting that medium density development R2 generates more sewage.

M. Prevost commented that in the recommendation to go forward that there is suggestion that I misinterpreted the report; she felt this was a subtle way to attack her integrity and ability to comprehend what is written in black on white and highlighted in red.

M. Prevost commented that many were subjected to highly toxic sewer entering our homes in the approximate 9 weeks following the issuance of this MPE report and many are still recovering. Further stating that many homeowners no longer have sewer backup coverage and that to allow additional sewer to enter this system based on noted facts within this appeal is putting our homes further at risk.

M. Prevost indicated the sewer issues need to be resolved prior to allowing these developments to move forward. That they be resolved with concrete accuracy and documented proof of repairs and upgrades provided to all concerned before going forward with these developments. She requested a recording of these proceedings.

M. Prevost ended her presentation by commenting that in her opinion Rudyard Kiplings statement from over 100 years ago that all hell for a basement has taken on a new meaning.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer referenced his report to the Board dated March 18, 2014 providing a history of the application and the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission that was included in the package. (Report attached)

B. Hawrelak asked for Interpretation of Section 58 (6) of the Land Use Bylaw with regard to garbage enclosures. The Development Officer advised he had spoken with Public Services Director and garbage would be picked up along Broadway Ave in similar fashion as Redcliff Way.

Board members discussed the size of the lots.

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission (MPC)

MPC Chairman advised that the MPC had met and reviewed the applications using information provided by the Planning Consultant and Development Officer and approved them in good faith thinking the proposed development is good for the area.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant noted the following:

- That Development Applications 14-DP-13 and 14-DP-17 are similar while Applications 14-DP-14, 14-DP-15, and 14-DP-16 which are the interior lots are different.
- It is important to follow through the formal hearing process for each appeal individually, but it should be noted that the first two appeals will establish precedence that should likely be carried forward through the other three appeals.
- The Development Authority can require a Development Agreement for the construction of public infrastructure if it deems necessary (MGA Section 650 and LUB 18(4)).
 - Thus, it is appropriate for an appeal to be based on claimed missing infrastructure.
- Section 686(1)(d) states that the Board is to determine whom is affected and if they should be heard. Review of case law suggests that the Board should be careful to not detract from the integrity of the appeal process by allowing those whom are not truly affected a voice.
 - Please note that only a couple of residents who signed the petition are in the immediate area and on the same sanitary system, thus the question of truly affected should be reviewed.
 - Nevertheless erring on the side of cautiousness I suggest that the board considers those not in the immediate area, but weigh their impact as part of the Board's decision.

Background Information and Analysis**1. Sanitary Capacity**

- I am a professional planner and am not able to give expert advice regarding the engineering report.
- Note: the appeal only includes excerpts of the Town report – truly difficult to assess.
- And the professionals in the field who commissioned and authored the report do not share the same conclusions as the appellants.

2. No Rear Lane

- To create a new Town lane requires the dedication of land. This process happens at subdivision – the application before the Board is for a development permit.
- In the past when the parcels were subdivided and created no land for a lane was requested by the Subdivision Authority.
- Thus the Development Authority acted consistently with past decisions.
- The absence of a rear lane is not a safety issue and many parts of the Town do not have rear lanes and many communities are now built with no rear lanes.
- Planning Consultant suggested the requirement for a rear lane not be added as a condition.

3. Side Yard Setback

- This application is in conformance with the LUB and no error was made by the Development Authority.
- The 3m side yard requirement is achieved in the side yard adjacent to the street.
- As a note the purpose of the 3m side yard rule is not safety related. It is to allow private vehicular access to rear lots to accommodate a rear garage when there is no rear lane.
- This requirement was misinterpreted by the appellant as it does meet the LUB.

4. Sidewalks

- The LUB does not speak to the requirement of sidewalks.
- Public infrastructure at the block scale is usually a condition of subdivision, but the Development Authority had the power to include a condition that would require a sidewalk be constructed.
- The Town plans for a continuous sidewalk on the south side of Broadway.
- Town plans and technical staff state that there is no requirement for a sidewalk on the north side of Broadway.
- Planning Consultant suggested that sidewalks not be added as a condition.

Planning Consultant recommended that the Board make no changes to MPC's approval and uphold the decision with the same conditions

e) **Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing**

Simon Clewlow advised he had spoken with neighbors in the area and all have had an increase in issues in the last 4 years. Noting there have been weather changes and more capacity being added. He also asked for clarification on requirements for a sidewalk.

The Board asked for clarification if Mr. Clewlow's issues were seepage related or sewer back up related. He advised he could speak only for himself and his issues are seepage related. It was clarified that Mr. Clewlow does not have a basement.

The development permit applicant who was also served notice declined to comment.

f) **Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected**

No one requested to speak.

g) **Rebuttal of Appellant**

M. Prevost commented that semi-detached dwellings are a discretionary use in R1 zoning and this does not allow for consecutive multi family unit developments. The appropriate zoning would be R2 for this type of proposed document.

h) Other

B. Hawrelak questioned what the MPC minutes and the stipulation for a change in utilities at the cost of the developer was about. The Chairman responded that likely it is referencing a request for dual services which went through Council and was approved.

B. Hawrelak referenced the Manager of Engineer's report and the statement that says "the Town is in discussion with the City of Medicine Hat to upsize the capacity in their system to accommodate current and future flows" and questioned if at peak capacity does the gate to the City back up. Discussion followed with the Manager of Engineering explaining the sanitary system. He clarified that it is not a single trunk line going to the gate but is three lines. The Manager of Engineering confirmed that when there are huge capacities that a bottleneck can occur. However, the issue is with the south line and not with the north line. The north line was built larger to accommodate future capacity and thus has lots of capacity. In response to B. Hawrelak's question, The Manager of Engineering also confirmed that information is not based solely on reports and calculations and that Public Services have physically checked the manholes during rain events. It was explained that the July 6 rain event was a unique situation and the problem was with the lift station. B. Hawrelak questioned if the Town has intentions of correcting the problem. D. Kilpatrick responded that that is a subjective topic as what someone's interpretation of moving forward and taking action may not mean the same for all.

i) Recess

V. Lutz moved to meet in camera at 7:52 p.m. – Carried.

The Appellant, Development Officer, Planning Consultant, and other members left the meeting at 7:52 p.m.

j) Decision

C. Crozier moved the appeal from M. Prevost appealing the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission for Development Permit Application 14-DP-013 be denied. Further that the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission to approve with conditions Development Permit Application 14-D-013 for a Semi-Detached Dwelling at Lot 43, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (326 Broadway Avenue W.) be upheld. – Carried.

Reasons for Decision

1. This parcel is zoned R-1 and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw; the proposed development is listed as discretionary use under the R-1 Single Family Residential District.
2. Based on the information provided the proposed development will not have any undue impact on the sanitary system.
3. Having a rear lane is not identified as being a safety issue.
4. The proposed development is on a corner lot and setbacks are in conformance with the Land Use Bylaw.
5. Based on the Master Transportation Study there is no recommendation/requirement for sidewalks on the north side of Broadway Avenue.

V. Lutz moved to return to regular session at 8:25 p.m. – Carried.

The Appellant, Development Officer, Planning Consultant and other members of the public returned to the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Chairman Kilpatrick advised the appellant of the decision and that the written decision would be forthcoming.

4. APPEAL NO. 2

**Appeal of Development Permit Application 14-DP-014
Lot 44, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (320 Broadway Avenue W)
Semi-Detached Housing Development**

Chairman Kilpatrick asked the appellant if she had any objection to any board members hearing the appeal. M. Prevost advised she had no objection to any member of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Recording Secretary distributed a copy of the motion for Development Permit Application 14-DP-014 from the Municipal Planning Commission minutes of the February 19, 2014 meeting. She also distributed correspondence addressed to B. Hawrelak, V. Lutz, G. Shipley, D. Kilpatrick and C. Crozier from D. Prpick, a member of the MPC, which referenced this appeal.

a) Presentation of Appellant

D. Kilpatrick asked M. Prevost to present her appeal. She advised her presentation was exactly the same as the presentation for Appeal of Development Permit Application 14-DP-013. M. Prevost and the Board members agreed it was not necessary to repeat the presentation.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer indicated his comments are similar to those that he gave during the first appeal. He indicated the applications were reviewed at the Municipal Planning Commission meeting of February 19 and the concerns identified by the appellant were discussed. The Development Officer also commented that there is nothing in the Land Use Bylaw which restricts continuous multiunit dwellings. Further that each of these applications were considered on their own merit and are individual applications on separate parcels.

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission

The Municipal Planning Commission Chairman advised their decision was based on the information provided and admittedly they overlooked the requirement in the Land Use Bylaw the requirement for a 3 m setback on one side for lots with no rear lane. Further they made their decision based on the best interests of the community as a whole.

The MPC Chairman asked to be excused from the proceedings and noted his comments for the next three appeals would be the same.

MPC Chairman left at 8:37 p.m.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant indicated his comments are similar to those that he gave during the first appeal with the exception of a few statements on the sideyard setback as follows:

- For the interior lots, such as this one, a 3m side yard setback is a requirement of the LUB and MPC and others missed the rule in applying it.
- The SDAB is not governed by same ruling and has the ability to determine if it is required or not.
- The purpose rule is to allow private vehicular access to rear lots to accommodate a rear garage when there is no rear lane. The proposed developments all have front garages, and it does not show that there is any requirement for rear vehicular access.
- When the north parcel develops the Subdivision Authority can require a lane to be dedicated, which would provide rear access to these lots.
- The Planning Consultant indicated his recommendation is similar to the last one with the exception that the board waive the 3 m sideyard setback requirement and approve the application as presented with the same conditions as imposed by the MPC.

e) Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing

No presentations.

f) Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected

No presentations.

g) Rebuttal of Appellant/Applicant

M. Prevost commented that she cannot get past the R1 & R2 discretionary use and the allowance for consecutive multi-unit dwellings. Further she expressed concerns with the rear lane and if it will get addressed at a later date or missed again.

h) Other

The Board accepted for information correspondence directed to V. Lutz, B. Hawrelak, G. Shipley, C. Crozier and D. Kilpatrick received March 28, 2014 with referenced appeal 14-DP-014. (attached)

i) Recess

B. Hawrelak moved to meet in camera at 8:43 p.m. – Carried.

The Appellant, Development Officer, and Planning Consultant, and others left the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

j) Decision

G. Shipley moved the appeal from M. Prevost appealing the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission for Development Permit Application 14-DP-014 be denied. Further that that Development Permit Application 14-D-014 for a Semi-Detached Dwelling at Lot 44, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (320 Broadway Avenue W.) be approved as submitted with a reduced sideyard setback with the following conditions:

1. A grade plan showing drainage to public lands or an instrument registered to title on Lots 43-47, Block 91, Plan 9411418 allowing drainage to the satisfaction of the Manager of Engineering.
2. A Construction Damage Deposit paid to the Town of Redcliff. The fee as per Bylaw 1752/2013.
3. Submission of a complete set of blueprints to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.
4. Relocation of affected utility services to the satisfaction of all utility departments. Please be advised that relocation of services is at the applicant's expense. The Town has not confirmed utility locations and it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the development does not interfere with the utilities, and utility right-of-way.
- Carried.

Reasons for Decision

1. Agree with waiving the 3 m sideyard setback as a garage is proposed to be developed on the front and there should be no requirement for rear access for a vehicle.
2. This parcel is zoned R-1 and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw; the proposed development is listed as discretionary use under the R-1 Single Family Residential District.
3. Based on the information provided the proposed development will not have any undue impact on the sanitary system.
4. Having a rear lane is not identified as being a safety issue.
5. Based on the Master Transportation Study there is no recommendation/requirement for sidewalks on the north side of Broadway Avenue.

C. Crozier moved to return to regular session at 9:03 p.m. – Carried.

The Appellant, Development Officer, Planning Consultant and other members of the public returned to the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Chairman Kilpatrick advised the appellant of the decision and that the written decision would be forthcoming.

5. APPEAL NO. 3

Appeal of Development Application 14-DP-015

Lot 45, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (314 Broadway Avenue W)

Semi-Detached Housing Development

a) Presentation of Appellant

D. Kilpatrick asked M. Prevost to present her appeal. She advised her presentation was exactly the same as the presentation for Appeal of Development Permit Application 14-DP-013.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer indicated his comments are similar to those that he gave during the first two appeals.

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission

As per comments from the MPC Chairman the MPC decision was based on the information provided and admittedly they overlooked the requirement in the Land Use Bylaw the requirement for a 3 m setback on one side for lots with no rear lane. Further they made their decision based on the best interests of the community as a whole.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant indicated his comments were the same as he gave during the first and second appeal.

e) Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing

No presentations.

f) Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected

No presentations.

g) Rebuttal of Appellant/Applicant

M. Prevost indicated her comments were the same as previously mentioned.

h) Other

The Board accepted for information correspondence directed to V. Lutz, B. Hawrelak, G. Shipley, C. Crozier and D. Kilpatrick received March 28, 2014 with referenced appeal 14-DP-015. (attached)

i) Decision

G. Shipley moved the appeal from M. Prevost appealing the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission for Development Permit Application 14-DP-015 be denied. Further that that Development Permit Application 14-D-015 for a Semi-Detached Dwelling at Lot 45, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (326 Broadway Avenue W.) be approved as submitted with a reduced sideyard setback with the following conditions:

1. A grade plan showing drainage to public lands or an instrument registered to title on Lots 43-47, Block 91, Plan 9411418 allowing drainage to the satisfaction of the Manager of Engineering.
2. A Construction Damage Deposit paid to the Town of Redcliff. The fee as per Bylaw 1752/2013.
3. Submission of a complete set of blueprints to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.
4. Relocation of affected utility services to the satisfaction of all utility departments. Please be advised that relocation of services is at the applicant's expense. The Town has not confirmed utility locations and it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the development does not interfere with the utilities, and utility right-of-way.
- Carried.

Reasons for Decision

1. Agree with waiving the 3 m sideyard setback as a garage is proposed to be developed on the front and there should be no requirement for rear access for a vehicle.
2. This parcel is zoned R-1 and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw; the proposed development is listed as discretionary use under the R-1 Single Family Residential District.
3. Based on the information provided the proposed development will not have any undue impact on the sanitary system.
4. Having a rear lane is not identified as being a safety issue.
5. Based on the Master Transportation Study there is no recommendation/requirement for sidewalks on the north side of Broadway Avenue.

6. APPEAL NO. 4**Appeal of Development Application 14-DP-016****Lot 46, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (308 Broadway Avenue W)****Semi-Detached Housing Development****a) Presentation of Appellant**

D. Kilpatrick asked M. Prevost to present her appeal. She advised her presentation was exactly the same as the presentation for Appeal of Appeal of Development Permit Application 14-DP-013.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer indicated his comments are similar to those that he gave during the first two appeals.

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission

As per comments from the MPC Chairman the MPC decision was based on the information provided and admittedly they overlooked the requirement in the Land Use Bylaw the requirement for a 3 m setback on one side for lots with no rear lane. Further they made their decision based on the best interests of the community as a whole.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant indicated his comments were the same as he gave during the first and second appeal.

e) Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing

No presentations.

f) Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected

No presentations.

g) Rebuttal of Appellant/Applicant

M. Prevost indicated her comments were the same as previously mentioned.

h) Other

The Board accepted for information correspondence directed to V. Lutz, B. Hawrelak, G. Shipley, C. Crozier and D. Kilpatrick received March 28, 2014 with referenced appeal 14-DP-016. (attached)

i) Decision

G. Shipley moved the appeal from M. Prevost appealing the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission for Development Permit Application 14-DP-016 be denied. Further that that Development Permit Application 14-D-016 for a Semi-Detached Dwelling at Lot 46, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (308 Broadway Avenue W.) be approved as submitted with a reduced sideyard setback with the following conditions:

1. A grade plan showing drainage to public lands or an instrument registered to title on Lots 43-47, Block 91, Plan 9411418 allowing drainage to the satisfaction of the Manager of Engineering.
 2. A Construction Damage Deposit paid to the Town of Redcliff. The fee as per Bylaw 1752/2013.
 3. Submission of a complete set of blueprints to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.
 4. Relocation of affected utility services to the satisfaction of all utility departments. Please be advised that relocation of services is at the applicant's expense. The Town has not confirmed utility locations and it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the development does not interfere with the utilities, and utility right-of-way.
- Carried.
-

Reasons for Decision

1. Agree with waiving the 3 m sideyard setback as a garage is proposed to be developed on the front and there should be no requirement for rear access for a vehicle.
2. This parcel is zoned R-1 and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw; the proposed development is listed as discretionary use under the R-1 Single Family Residential District.
3. Based on the information provided the proposed development will not have any undue impact on the sanitary system.
4. Having a rear lane is not identified as being a safety issue.
5. Based on the Master Transportation Study there is no recommendation/requirement for sidewalks on the north side of Broadway Avenue.

7. APPEAL NO. 5

Appeal of Development Application 14-DP-017

Lot 47, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (302 Broadway Avenue W)

Semi-Detached Housing Development

a) Presentation of Appellant

D. Kilpatrick asked M. Prevost to present her appeal. She advised her presentation was exactly the same as the presentation for Appeal of Development Permit Application 14-DP-013.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer indicated his comments are similar to those that he gave during the first two appeals.

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission

As per comments from the MPC Chairman the MPC decision was based on the information provided and admittedly they overlooked the requirement in the Land Use Bylaw the requirement for a 3 m setback on one side for lots with no rear lane. Further they made their decision based on the best interests of the community as a whole.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant indicated his comments were the same as he gave during the first and second appeal.

e) Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing

No presentations.

f) Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected

No presentations.

g) Rebuttal of Appellant/Applicant

M. Prevost indicated her comments were the same as previously mentioned.

h) Other

Nothing further.

i) Decision

C. Crozier moved the appeal from M. Prevost appealing the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission for Development Permit Application 14-DP-017 be denied. Further that the decision of the Municipal Planning Commission to approve with conditions Development Permit Application 14-D-017 for a Semi-Detached Dwelling at Lot 47, Block 91, Plan 9411418 (302 Broadway Avenue W.) be upheld. – Carried.

Reasons for Decision

1. This parcel is zoned R-1 and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw; the proposed development is listed as discretionary use under the R-1 Single Family Residential District.
2. Based on the information provided the proposed development will not have any undue impact on the sanitary system.
3. Having a rear lane is not identified as being a safety issue.
4. The proposed development is on a corner lot and setbacks are in conformance with the Land Use Bylaw.
5. Based on the Master Transportation Study there is no recommendation/requirement for sidewalks on the north side of Broadway Avenue.

4. ADJOURNMENT

P. Monteith moved the meeting be adjourned at 9:17 p.m.



Chairman



S. Simon, Recording Secretary