

MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2011 – 12:30 PM
TOWN OF REDCLIFF COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MINUTES

PRESENT: Members: C. Dacre, B. Duncan, B. Lowery
D. MacDougall, D. Wirth
Public Services Director: D. Schaffer
Development Officer &
Recording Secretary: D. Mastel
Development Officer: B. Crozier

ABSENT: Members: J. Beach
Planning Consultant: K. Snyder

1. CALL TO ORDER

B. Duncan called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

C. Dacre moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. - Carried.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES

D. MacDougall moved acceptance of the minutes of the November 17, 2010 meeting as presented. - Carried

4. LIST OF DEVELOPMENT PERMITS ADVERTISED

The Commission reviewed the development permits advertised in the Cypress Courier/Commentator on November 23, 2010 and were advised by the Development Officer that no appeals had been received.

5. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

- A) Development Permit Application 10-DP-160
Amron Construction
Lot 15, Block 1, Plan 971 1118 (170 Saskatchewan Drive NE)
Approved: Addition
- B) Development Permit Application 10-DP-162
Matt Nelligan
Lots 37-38, Block 28, Plan 1117V (334 2 Street SE)
Approved: Basement Development
- C) Development Permit Application 10-DP-163
LeDawn Heringer
Lot 11, Block 100, Plan 001 3221 (137 3 Street NW)
Approved: Basement Development
- D) Development Permit Application 10-DP-164
Jakob Thiessen
Lot 33-34, Block 94, Plan 1117V (13 6 Street NW)

Approved: Detached Garage

- E) Development Permit Application 10-DP-165
Kelly Davies and Maureen Hilsendeger
Lots 30-31, Block 2, Plan 3042AV (520 5 Street SE)
Approved: Basement Development
- F) Development Permit Application 10-DP-166
Quantum Murray
Lots 1-5, Block 80, Plan 755AD (701 Broadway Ave NE)
Approved: Underground Fuel Tank Removal
- G) Development Permit Application 10-DP-167
Jim and Carol Lines
Lot 6, Block 7, Plan 981 3130 (6 Redcliff Way SW)
Approved: Basement Development
- H) Development Permit Application 11-DP-002
Bill and Cathy Crozier
Lots 27-28, Block 2, Plan 1117V (914 2 Street SE)
Approved: Wood Burning Stove

6. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR MPC CONSIDERATION

- A) **Development Permit Application 10-DP-169**
GVN Structures
Lots 11-14, Block 80, Plan 931 0188 (#6 511 South Railway Drive NE)
Tenant Improvements – Operation of a Fire Hall

B. Crozier left the meeting at 12:35 p.m.

D. MacDougall made comment that he was unclear as to what exactly the Commission was to be approving. D. Mastel clarified that the application was brought forth to the MPC due to the use of the proposed business, being the Cypress County Fire Department. Since emergency services aren't specifically listed under permitted or discretionary uses in any of the land use districts she thought the application would be suited best to have the Commissions review.

Concerns were raised about the train blocking the route on to the highway from the proposed location. B. Lowery stated that concern, although valid, isn't something the Commission should be considering in their decision. D. Mastel stated that their concern was probably something that the fire department had considered when choosing a location for their fire hall and that the Commission should mainly be considering if the use of the fire hall suits the location and the zoning of the property.

B. Lowery raised a question that if approval was given for the fire department to operate from this location, should the Commission consider

putting on a condition regarding parking. It was discussed that parking would be available along the front of the building as well as along the street and since the total amount of vehicles being parked would be there for a short period of time that it was not a concern.

B. Crozier re-joined the meeting at 12:46 p.m.

The Commission re-visited the item at the end of the meeting, B. Crozier then left the meeting again at 1:20 p.m.

B. Lowery move that development permit application **10-DP-169** for GVN Structures Inc. on Lots 11-14, Block 80, Plan 931 0188 (#6 511 South Railway Drive NE) be **APPROVED** subject to the following condition(s):

1. All conditions and approvals from the original Development Permit, 07-DP-126, shall be adhered to, the permit conditions state:

This development approval is valid for the foundation and the shell of the building ONLY. Once it has been determined who the new tenants will be to occupy the building, a new development permit application shall be submitted for the Commercial or Industrial Development. A complete development permit application shall be submitted, and must include a complete detailed site drainage plan which must meet the requirements of the Town's Engineer. The new building tenant shall also submit a detailed letter of intent including a description of the proposed development and use, and all other requested pertinent information.

An approved site drainage plan was submitted showing paving that is required. This paving shall be completed in front of the bays for this application within one year from the date of issuance.

- Carried.

**B) Development Permit Application 11-DP-003
Brittany Streifel
Lot 14, Block 6, Plan 001 2006 (961 Kipling Crescent SW)
Home Occupation – Cleaning Service**

C. Dacre moved that development permit application **11-DP-003** for Brittany Streifel on Lot 14, Block 6, Plan 001 2006 (961 Kipling Crescent SW) be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. All Development Standards, as listed under Section 58(9(d)) of Residential Districts in the Town of Redcliff's Land Use Bylaw shall be adhered to by the applicant.

- Carried.

**C) Development Permit Application 11-DP-004
Baron Oilfield Supply
Lots 11-14, Block 80, Plan 931 0188 (#9 511 South Railway Drive NE)
Freestanding Sign and Outdoor Storage**

D. Mastel clarified that the application was for the use of the pump jack located in the front of the building to be used as the sign for Baron Oilfield, the application was also to receive permission to store material related to the business, outside, on the west end of the building.

C. Dacre inquired whether the applicant would be changing the location of the sign since, at this point in time; the pump jack had been removed. D. Mastel stated that by her understanding that wasn't the applicants' intention. She thought that what had happened is that Baron had either sold or leased out the pump jack and are probably intending to replace it. She added that typically when someone puts up a free standing sign, it's usually a permanent structure and that it's not taken down, sold and then replaced again.

B. Crozier stated that when he and D. Mastel did a site visit, he noticed that there was an accumulation material being collected from the business on the outside of the building and particularly in the front, being street side. He added that it appeared to look junky and compared to the neighbouring lots of commercial and residential, it seemed like the use of the business was starting to become more industrial than commercial. B. Crozier then added that when Baron first applied to operate their business from this location, it was for office use only and that D. Mastel had a conversation with the owner inquiring if there would be any outdoor storage of materials or pump jacks. She was told that there would be no outdoor storage; however as time passed then material started to accumulate outside of the business. B. Crozier then compared Baron Oilfield to National Oilwell, which is located across the highway on an industrial zoned parcel; and stated that a person could hardly tell what the nature of their business is due to the screening and the size of their lot which allows for storage.

B. Crozier then mentioned that he spoke with the owner of the building, Doug Turner from GVN, and inquired when the paving was going to be done, as it was a requirement of the original development approval. Mr. Turner stated that as the bays in the building filled up then he would meet the paving condition. B. Crozier suggested that if the Commission approves this application that they should consider attaching a condition regarding the completion of the paving.

D. MacDougall moved that development permit application **11-DP-004** for Baron Oilfield Supply on Lot 14, Block 80, Plan 931 0188 (#9 511 South Railway Drive NE) be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

Subsection (7) of Section 51 from the Town of Redcliff's Land Use Bylaw states:

*'No sign shall be constructed, placed, relocated, or altered in a manner that, in the opinion of the Development Officer and/or the Commission:
(a) conflicts with the general character of the surrounding streetscape or the architecture of buildings in the area;'*

Subsections (3) and (5) of Section 40 Outdoor Storage and Maintenance – Non-Residential Districts from the Town of Redcliff's Land Use Bylaw state:

(3) Any storage of materials as cited in this Section shall not be permitted in the required front yard or any property unless and until approved by the Development Officer or the Commission, as the case may be.

(5) Accumulation of vehicle parts or materials shall not be allowed, unless authorized by a valid development permit.

Subsection (6), Section 640 from the Municipal Government Act states:

(6) A land use bylaw may authorize a development authority to decide on an application for a development permit even though the proposed development does not comply with the land use bylaw or is a non-conforming building if, in the opinion of the development authority,

(a) the proposed development would not

(i) unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood, or

(ii) materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of neighbouring parcels of land,


and

(b) the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for that land or building in the land use bylaw.

- Carried.

7. ADJOURNMENT

D. Schaffer moved adjournment of the meeting at 1:23 p.m. – Carried.


Chairman


Secretary