

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SUBDIVISION
AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.**

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

Development Officer	B. Stehr
Planning Consultant	K. Snyder
Recording Secretary	S. Simon
Appellants	R. Fai (owner)

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 this appeal; and opened nominations for Chairman.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

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

**3. Appeal of Development Application 14-DP-011
Lot 12, Block 9, Plan 7711421 (45 Industrial Drive SE)
Variance to sideyard setback on west side of parcel**

Chairman D. Kilpatrick asked the appellants if they had any objection to any board members hearing the appeal. R. Fai advised he had no objection to any member of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

a) Presentation of Appellant

Recording Secretary distributed additional information to the Board members that was submitted relating to the application.

R. Fai explained they are proposing to build a 146 unit mini storage facility. They are seeking a relaxation to the west side yard setback to .9 m which would minimize mess and there would be less yard to maintain. They are also looking to vary the setback on the front to 3.2 m. R. Fai referenced the photos indicating the development would be similar to what is shown in the pictures. They would install the facility with lots of lighting and would have security cameras in place. He further advised that there would be a 24 hour kiosk.

b) Presentation of Development Officer

The Development Officer referenced his report dated March 5, 2014 providing the background of the application. He noted that initially the units proposed encroached into the corner visibility triangle on the southwest corner. The applicants have submitted a revised drawing showing no encroachment of the units into the corner visibility triangle.

However they are still looking to vary the setback on the west side to .9 m and on the front to 3.2m.

The Development Officer commented that there is a 1.5 m utility right of way along the west property line. A water line runs north/south in Boundary Road and the utility right of way appears to be for the purpose of having sufficient space for repairs and maintenance on the water line. He advised he confirmed with the Manager of Engineering that there would be no need to expand the utility right of way.

The Development Officer further advised that in the event the appeal is upheld that the following conditions should be considered

1. An Engineered Site Drainage Plan to the satisfaction of the Town of Redcliff Engineering Department.
2. The approach onto Industrial Drive to be constructed to the Town of Redcliff construction standards.
3. The approach onto Industrial drive, and that area between the fences up to the gated entrance to be hard surfaced within 24 months of the start of development
4. The fence on the east property line is on the easterly edge of a Registered Utility Right of Way. Should access to the Utility Right of Way become necessary, the cost of upkeep or rebuilding of the fence will be at the Owners expense.
5. Accumulation of wrecked vehicles, vehicle parts or materials shall not be allowed.
6. Any screening done at the Developer shall comply with the Town of Redcliff's Land Use Bylaw section 75.
7. Signage may require a Development Permit

c) Presentation of Municipal Planning Commission (MPC)

No one was in attendance.

d) Presentation of Planning Consultant

The Planning Consultant referenced the proposed development and proposal to vary the east side yard setback and the front yard setback. He noted only one property owner on the west side is affected. Planning Consultant indicated he did not have any concerns with the reduced setback on the sideyard nor the front where one unit encroaches. The Planning Consultant expressed concern that the fence encroaches into the southeast corner visibility triangle which may obstructs sight lines and create a safety issue at the intersection. He further expressed some concern with the placement of the kiosk and the gate entrance which is approximately 10m from the edge of roadway. Dependent on the length of the vehicle, a vehicle could extend into the roadway. The Planning Consultant commented that Medicine Hat intends to develop Boundary Road into a 4 lane divided arterial.

The Planning Consultant recommended the development application be approved with the conditions identified by the Development Officer plus that no fencing, contrary to the Land Use Bylaw, be allowed in the corner visibility triangle.

e) Presentation of anyone served notice of hearing

No one was in attendance.

Correspondence from City of Medicine Hat Planning Services indicated they had no objections to the proposed storage yard.

f) Presentation of anyone claiming to be affected

No further comments.

g) Rebuttal of Appellant/Applicant

R. Fai indicated he had no concerns with no fencing being within the corner visibility triangle. He noted that if they are required to move the kiosk they could have problems with turning radius.

B. Hawrelak questioned if the fire hydrant along boundary road is inside or outside of the fenceline.

Discussion ensued with the location of the kiosk and gate access.

h) Other

Nothing further.

i) Recess

B. Hawrelak moved to meet in camera at 7:47 p.m. – Carried.

The Appellant, Development Officer, and Planning Consultant left the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

j) Decision

P. Monteith moved that the appeal against the decision of the Development Officer to refuse to issue a permit for Development Permit Application 14-DP-011, Lot 6, Block 1, Plan 0012975 (2250 South Highway Drive SE) for a mini storage unit be upheld and the decision of the Development Officer be revoked. Further that Development Permit Application 14-DP-011, Lot 6, Block 1, Plan 0012975 (2250 South Highway Drive SE) for a mini storage unit with reduced setbacks be approved with the following conditions:

1. An Engineered Site Drainage Plan to the satisfaction of the Town of Redcliff Engineering Department.

2. The approach onto Industrial Drive to be constructed to the Town of Redcliff construction standards.
3. The approach onto Industrial Drive, and that area between the fences up to the gated entrance to be hard surfaced within 24 months of the start of development
4. The fence on the east property line is on the easterly edge of a Registered Utility Right of Way. Should access to the Utility Right of Way become necessary, the cost of upkeep or rebuilding of the fence will be at the Owners expense.
5. Accumulation of wrecked vehicles, vehicle parts or materials shall not be allowed.
6. Any screening done by the Developer shall comply with the Town of Redcliff's Land Use Bylaw section 75.
7. Signage may require a Development Permit.
8. No fencing is allowed within the corner visibility triangle.
9. Front gate access shall be a minimum of 10 m from property line.
10. Fire hydrant located on boundary road to be located outside any fencing.

- Carried.

Reasons for Decision:

1. The proposed development does not negatively impact the neighbourhood and will still allow access to both properties.
2. All concerns were addressed through conditions and through submission of revised plan.

B. Hawrelak moved to return to regular session at 8:09 p.m.

The Appellant(s), Development Officer, and Planning Consultant returned to the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

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

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

P. Monteith moved the meeting be adjourned at 8:15 p.m.



Chairman



S. Simon, Recording Secretary