

**MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2011 – 12:30 PM  
TOWN OF REDCLIFF COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Members: J. Beach, B. Duncan, B. Lowery,  
D. MacDougall, B. Vine, D. Wirth  
Municipal Secretary D. Schaffer,  
Shanon Simon  
Planning Consultant: K. Snyder  
Confidential Secretary C. Cranston

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

D. Wirth moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. - Carried.

**3. PREVIOUS MINUTES**

D. Schaffer moved acceptance of the minutes of the September 21, 2011 meeting as presented. - Carried

**4. LIST OF DEVELOPMENT PERMITS ADVERTISED**

The Commission reviewed the development permits advertised in the Cypress Courier/Commentator on September 20, September 27, October 4 and October 11, 2011 and were advised that no appeals had been received.

**5. DISCRETIONARY USE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER**

- A) Development Permit Application 11-DP-109  
Lots 1-5, Block 80, Plan 755AD (701 Broadway Avenue E)  
Approved with Conditions: Redevelopment of a Service Station with a new canopy

**6. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR MPC CONSIDERATION**

- A) **Development Permit Applications 11-DP-110  
Lot 21-22, Block 131, Plan 1117V (343 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW)  
Relocation of a Manufactured Home**

Chairman Duncan commented that the inspection document included in the application for the relocation of a manufactured home was very thorough and appeared to include everything that was previously provided by the applicant on the Procedure for Relocating Buildings check list. D. Wirth further noted that the structure is only three years old and appears to be in good condition with little or no repairs required other than gutters and down spouts.

K. Snyder commented that the applicant has included a copy of an agreement to “grant easement and allow encroachment” from an adjacent parcel of garage eaves, which is encroaching into Lot 21, and Lot 22 by as much as 3.09 m and also some concrete which encroaches into Lot 22 by as much as 1.86m. B. Vine questioned what would happen to the agreement if the property is sold. K. Snyder advised that the agreement would remain in effect until such time as it is removed from the title. B. Vine suggested that it may be better for the applicant to proceed with a subdivision application to allow for a change in the size of the property and eliminate the encroachments. S. Simon advised that the adjacent property owner has plans for a future subdivision and development which would include the removal of existing structures and development of residential lots.

K. Snyder commented that in the past the Commission typically would consider a security deposit to cover any repairs to the relocated structure and to ensure that the structure would be aesthetically suitable to the surrounding area. Concerns were expressed that damages could occur to the siding or structural integrity of the structure during transport and the photos would not necessarily represent the condition of the structure upon arrival at the property on which it will be located. Discussion ensued with regard to the amount of the deposit and what repairs would be part of the conditions as well as who would perform the inspection to ensure that the structure was equal to the photos that were provided in the inspection report and that the building is structurally sound.

K. Snyder reviewed Part III, Section 22 Development Completion Certificates paragraph (1) which states “The Development Authority may include as a condition of any Development Permit or Development Agreement that a Development Completion Certificate must be issued prior to occupancy and use of the site as approved in the Development Permit.” He commented that a Development Completion Certificate would not be granted until all conditions of the Development Permit have been met. Discussion ensued with regard to who would do the inspection prior to issuance of the DCC. S. Simon advised that the Town would arrange to have the structure inspected.

K. Snyder suggested that conditions of approval should represent the broader description. For example instead of including reference to a specific section of the Land Use Bylaw there is a risk of missing something that else that may be equally important. A condition that states must meet the requirements of the Town of Redcliff Land Use bylaw would ensure that all requirements of the LUB are included in the conditions. Similarly the Alberta Building Code and Alberta Fire Code should be included in the conditions to ensure that the current regulations are met.

B. Vine moved that development permit application 11-DP-110 to relocate a Manufactured Home on Lot 21-22, Block 131, Plan 1117V (343 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW) be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Payment of a security deposit in the amount of \$5,000.00 which will be refundable upon a satisfactory inspection of the structure and the issuance of a Development Completion Certificate.
- 2) Development must meet the requirements of the Town of Redcliff Land

Use Bylaw.

- 3) Development must meet the requirements of the Alberta Building Code.
- 4) Development must meet the requirements of the Alberta Fire Code.
- 5) It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the exterior finish is consistent with that of a new building. Consequently, all exterior finish 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. – Carried.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

J. Beach moved adjournment of the meeting at 12:57 p.m. – Carried.

  
Chairman

  
Secretary