

Discussion ensued with regard to clarification on the recommended condition # 5 for an inspection to be performed by a "Building Inspector", as in the past reports have been accepted from a Home Inspector, Structural Engineer, or SCO Building Inspector. The Planning Consultant advised the Commission that typically in the instance of a relocation of a residence an inspection would be conducted and a copy of the report submitted with the application, which would indicate the condition of the building. In the case of this accessory building this was not done, because it was questioned what type of report is necessary. The Commission could ask for an inspection prior to the accessory building be moved onto the property, if necessary. Discussion ensued and it was the Commission's opinion that the Development Officer could inspect the building to ensure that conditions of approval are met, therefore no inspection report prior to moving the building on site would be required. S. Simon advised that this development application will be subject to obtaining a Building Permit and there would likely be an inspection process.

S. Simon asked the Commission what amount they would like to establish for a security/damage deposit. She advised that the Town typically applies a construction damage deposit of \$500.00 for residential development and \$1,000.00 for Industrial development for damage to infrastructure however; relocated buildings have had to pay a deposit from \$5,000.00 to \$10,000.00, which is for ensuring the structure and aesthetics is completed. She further noted that the relocated building is an accessory building and not a primary residence. Discussion ensued and it was the consensus of the Commission to charge a \$500.00 security/damage deposit. J. Beach asked if it would be possible to impose a shorter time line to help expedite the completion of the project. The Planning Consultant advised that there could be no deviation from the 1 year term for a Development Permit.

B. Lowery moved that Development Permit Application 12-DP-016 for Mark Renz to relocate an Accessory Building onto Lot 24, Block 3, Plan 9011355 (502 Main Street SW) be APPROVED conditional to:

- 1) Payment of a security/damage deposit in the amount of Five Hundred dollars (\$500.00) which will be refundable upon a satisfactory inspection of the structure and the issuance of Development Completion Certificate.
- 2) Development must meet the requirements of the Town of Redcliff Land Use Bylaw.
- 3) It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the exterior finish is consistent with the house. Consequently, all exterior finish, including the roof, shall be replaced and /or repaired, at the expense of the applicant as required. In the event that certain items of the exterior finish have already been replaced, the applicant shall replace and/or repair such items as may have been damaged during the move. Any of the work to be carried out shall be to the satisfaction of the Town.
- 4) Confirmation that the building meets all relevant provisions of the *Alberta Building Code*, and the *Alberta Fire Code*. - Carried.

**B) Development Permit Application 12-DP-036
Juan Loeppky
Lot 52, Block 138, Plan 9812329 (326 Main Street N)
Attached Covered Deck**

The Planning Consultant commented that this is not a typical application. He advised the applicant is seeking to attach a covered deck to the manufactured home. The land use bylaw specifies a minimum side setback of 6 m on the side wall containing the main entrance door and 1.5m on the other side.

The setbacks of the manufactured home are:

Front	4.575 m
Side yard (back side of manufactured home)	1.587 m
Rear	11.791 m
Sideyard (wall with door)	2.036 m

and thus under this bylaw the residence becomes a non-conforming building. Under the previous land use bylaw the minimum side setbacks were 1.5m.

Part 11 Section 11(5), (6) and (7) of the Land Use Bylaw state:

- (5) Where a proposed specific use of land or a building is not provided for in a district, the Commission may determine that the use is similar in character and purpose to another use of land or building that is included in the list of permitted or discretionary uses prescribed for that district and may approve it as a Similar Use.
- (6) The Commission is authorized to decide upon an application for a Development Permit, even though the proposed development does not comply with this Bylaw or a non-conforming use if, in the opinion of the Commission:
 - (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 properties, and
 - (b) the proposed development conforms with the use prescribed for that land or building under this Bylaw.
- (7) The Commission has the authority to vary any condition or requirement of this Bylaw to a maximum variance allowance of 10% with the exception of sizes of accessory buildings.

The Planning Consultant advised the deck can be considered a minor addition as it does not prolong the longevity of the building nor change the use, therefore the Commission could, if they wish, approve the application for the covered deck. The design of the deck is the same as a conventional deck on a Single Family Dwelling.

The Planning Consultant advised the Commission that the Redcliff Planning Board discussed a the sideyard setback in the R-4 Manufactured Home Residential District, specifically the setback for the sidewall of the manufactured home containing the main entrance door which is stated as 6.0 m. It was determined that there was an error when the bylaw was written and was based on mobile home parks and minimum required distances between building being 6m. the Bylaw should say 4.5 m, which would still allow for a 6 m separation.

J. Beach moved that Development Permit Application 12-DP-036, for an attached covered deck on Lot 52, Block 138, Plan 9812329 (326 Main Street N) be approved as presented.
– Carried.

6. OLD BUSINESS

- A) Subdivision Application 2011 SUB 03**
Lot 11-13, Block 131, Plan 1117V
Lot 14, Block 131, Plan 1117V
Lot 15-20, Block 131, Plan 1117V and closed portion of lane
330 3 Street NW

The Planning Consultant advised the Commission that the Redcliff Planning Board had reviewed Subdivision Application 2011 SUB 03 in great detail at their meeting on May 15, 2012. He advised that there were concerns regarding the size of the lots, which are smaller than the 12 metre minimum size established in the Land Use Bylaw under R-4 Manufactured Home Residential District. The Planning Consultant advised the Redcliff Planning Board that the Subdivision Approving Authority is allowed to grant a relaxation of the lot size from what is established in the Land Use Bylaw.

He further noted that the Redcliff Planning Board considered that there appeared to be an error in the sideyard setback in R-4 Manufactured Home Residential District. The Land Use Bylaw states 6 m for the side of the manufactured home that has a door. The error may have occurred as manufactured/mobile home parks have a minimum setback between buildings of 6.0 m.; however there are no lot lines in a park setting. Since this appeared to be a clerical error Council may wish to consider correcting 6.0 m to 4.5 m sideyard setback and the Redcliff Planning Board is recommending a change to the Bylaw. The distance between structures will still be maintained and allow a building envelope to accommodate various sized manufacture homes (16 – 20 feet wide). If the lot sizes remain "as is" then it will be difficult to accommodate development.

S. Simon referred to the Redcliff Planning Board recommendation to Council and the conditions that would have to be met before endorsement of the subdivision application. The Commission did not have anything to add to the recommendation of the Redcliff Planning Board and had no further comments to add.

B. Vine moved that the Municipal Planning Board concurs with the recommendation of the Redcliff Planning Board and has no objection or concerns to Subdivision Application 2011 SUB 03.

7. ADJOURNMENT

D. Schaffer moved adjournment of the meeting at 1:10 p.m. – Carried.



Chairman



Secretary