



## MEETING MINUTES

Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, May 13, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.  
(Meeting took place by Video Conferencing)

Virtual Attendance: David Campbell, Chair  
Tina Beers, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair  
Shawn Dempsey, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair  
Art Ball, Committee Member  
Bob Riley, Committee Member  
Keith Whalen, Committee Member  
Kelvin Martin, Committee Member  
Lori Bickford, Planning Manager, SE Regional Service Commission  
Kirk Brewer, Planner, SE Regional Service Commission  
Rita Gauvin, Records Clerk-RTIPPA Coordinator, Town of Riverview  
Sheryl McNeil, Executive Administrative Assistant, Town of Riverview

Absent: Rob Bateman, Committee Member  
Tina Thibodeau, Committee Member

---

### 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

David Campbell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

The Chair noted the Town of Riverview and the Southeast Regional Service Commission continues to provide, to the greatest extent possible during interruptions due to COVID-19, planning and development services. The Town and Commission are following the recommendations of the public health authorities, while recognizing construction as an essential service.

Due to the need to proceed with certain meetings of the Planning Advisory Committee, until further notice, the Committee will proceed with virtual meetings. These meetings will allow Committee members to communicate orally with each other and to hear each other speak. In addition, these meetings will allow the public to hear the members speaking. The right to submit comments under the *Community Planning Act* will be respected during virtual meetings. Decisions and recommendations made in virtual meetings will have the same force and effect as if they had been made in a face-to-face meeting.

### 2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- 1) Kelvin Martin declared a conflict of interest with respect to Item 6 a).
  - 2) Shawn Dempsey declared a conflict of interest with respect to Item 6 c).
- Both members will be muted from the virtual meeting when each topic is presented.

### 3. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

Moved by Art Ball and seconded by Tina Beers that the agenda for the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of May 13, 2020 be APPROVED.

**MOTION CARRIED**

### 4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- a) Planning Advisory Committee Meeting – April 8, 2020

Moved by Keith Whalen and seconded by Kelvin Martin that the minutes of the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of April 8, 2020 be ADOPTED.

**MOTION CARRIED**

## 5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

NIL

## 6. VARIANCE, TEMPORARY APPROVALS, CONDITIONAL USES, RULINGS OF COMPATIBILITY AND NON-CONFORMING USES

Kirk Brewer, Planner, at the Southeast Regional Service Commission (SERSC) clarified no rezoning applications were being handled at this meeting. All applications being presented are for uses permitted within the zone for which the property is zoned. The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), in these cases, has authority to impose conditions; however, it is not a rezoning or a change in terms of what can be built on a property. As well, the variances would be discussed with each application.

Kelvin Martin was muted at this point in the virtual meeting on the discussion of this item at 6:10 p.m.

- a) Erik de Jong on behalf of Cordova Realty Ltd., 230 Coverdale Road (PID 05076799), Conditional use application to permit a 5 storey, 73 unit multiple unit building in the Suburban Commercial zone with a variance to increase the permitted height abutting residential zones to 17.4m with a maximum of five storeys (File 20-301)

Kirk Brewer presented a conditional use application to permit a 5 storey, 73-unit multiple building at 230 Coverdale, on a 2-acre parcel of land located at the corner of Coverdale Road and Golf Club Road. The property is zoned Suburban Commercial (SC), which permits a multi-unit dwelling subject to conditional approval by PAC. The proposal is to vary the height restrictions to permit a maximum of 17.4 metres with a maximum of 5 storeys when abutting residential zones. The building would provide 74 indoor parking spaces at the underground level as well as 32 surface parking spaces.

The proposed building exceeds the number of storeys permitted and exceeds the zone-specific building height by 2.4 metres. With respect to the number of storeys (maximum of three abutting an R1 zone, maximum of four abutting an R2 zone), it is important to note that the fifth occupied floor fits within the zone-specific 15 metre height maximum. The variance only pertains to the roof structure. The purpose to limiting the number of storeys reduces the potential number of windows and/or balconies looking directly down into low density back yards.

Three R1 properties are located to the south of the subject property, with the lot to the west being zoned R2, currently used for commercial purposes and as a result, the loss of residential privacy is less of a concern. The setbacks are being respected from each of the property lines as the building is at the permitted 15 metre set back from the R2 properties.

The Municipal Plan policy related to this project does encourage increased density along transit corridors as the plan notes Coverdale Road as a potential area of intensification over the years. There are additional policies related to development standards required for multi-unit buildings to respect their context through height restrictions, landscape buffers and setbacks that are all included in the zoning by-law.

A significant grade change occurs on the property, which will require the use of retaining walls to ensure site stability. There is currently a drainage ditch and small hill with trees of varying sizes abutting Golf Club Road, which acts as a natural safety barrier. The construction of the retaining wall would likely result in the removal of this barrier. Additional retaining walls would be incorporated to the south and west of the property. A guard rail and/or fence would be constructed atop these retaining walls to ensure public safety.

For the above noted reasons related to Municipal Plan policies pertaining to increased density based on location and the desire to intensify development along public transit corridors, as well as due to site-specific topography, large setbacks, and the existing tree buffer, the request to increase the height and number of storeys is reasonable and within the general intent of the Municipal Plan policies and the Zoning By-law.

Kirk Brewer presented the Committee with the proposed site plans as well as the renderings of the property in question. He also noted a new condition moving forward has been included to alert developers of a recently updated fire protection by-law requiring a key lock box be installed at the entrance of multi-unit buildings so the fire department may access the building easily in case of an emergency.

Notices were sent to neighbouring property owners within 60m of the subject property. Comments received from residents were regarding:

- 1) Lack of notification to condo owners in the Bella Casa complex. SERSC notifies property owners listed on neighbouring PIDs as per Service NB. Generally, all condo owners are notified, but in this instance, there was no immediate indication this was a condominium property.
- 2) Neighbours to the south submitted a letter expressing concern about traffic impacts on Coverdale Rd., the height of the building, and loss of privacy and views.
- 3) Neighbours to the east generally had no problems with the proposal but expressed wanting a privacy fence to separate the driveway/parking area from their property. A fence was already proposed, as per the zoning by-law.

The Chair called upon the applicant to speak if they wished to address the Committee.

Mr. John McManaman, President of Cordova Realty, mentioned an architect and urban planning firm had been engaged to plan and create a viable and quality product for this project. The intent of the design is to keep the building close to Coverdale Road and create a nice street scape as well as provide sufficient distance from adjacent properties.

The request of a variance of approximately a 6 ft. roof height would be to accommodate where all the mechanical systems would be located. Since the popularity of moving into apartments has increased with seniors and young professionals, this project offers a good opportunity of multi-residential units to residents in Riverview wishing to stay in their community and not have to manage a large property. It would also place residents along the Petitcodiac River to enjoy the riverfront trail and the downtown core of Riverview. Mr. McManaman remarked these types of units would become more in demand in the future.

The Chair called upon the members of the public to put their name forward if they wished to comment on this application. No comments from the public were received on the online platform. However, some residents who had already submitted written comments wanted to reiterate that the Committee do consider their concerns.

The following motions were made by the Committee:

Moved by Shawn Dempsey and seconded by Art Ball that the Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the request to permit a multiple unit building as a conditional use in the Suburban Commercial zone on PID 05076799 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That fencing be installed along Golf Club Rd. in accordance with Department of Transportation guidelines; such fencing shall require a plan that is stamped by an engineer licensed to practice in New Brunswick and is to be reviewed and accepted by the Town of Riverview's Engineering Department;
- 2) That any retaining wall greater than 1.2m in height shall include fencing, and shall require a plan that is stamped by an engineer licensed to practice in New Brunswick, to be reviewed and accepted by the Town of Riverview's Engineering Department;
- 3) That a minimum of 6 metres of the existing treed buffer be maintained along the southern property line.
- 4) That a key lock box be installed per municipal By-law 500-11.
- 5) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction: and
- 6) That the proposed development shall be in substantial conformity with the site plans, elevation drawings and renderings provided, and

That the Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance to increase the permitted height abutting residential zones on PID 05076799 to 17.4 metres with a maximum of five storeys because it is reasonable given the topography of the land and within the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kelvin Martin returned to the virtual meeting at 6:40 p.m.

- b) Robert Leblanc, Moemar Homes, 90 & 108 Runneymeade Road (PID 05093919), Conditional use application to permit more than one main building on a lot, and permit multiple-unit dwellings in an R3 zone with variances to 1) permit public entrances that do not face a public street, and 2) to increase the height of an accessory building from 3 metres to 4 metres (File 20-382)

Kirk Brewer presented an application to permit a multiple-unit dwelling as a conditional use in the Multiple Unit Dwelling (R3) zone with more than one building on the lot as well as variances to permit an accessory building with 4m walls where 3m is permitted, and to permit public entrances that do not face the street.

The Municipal Plan requires multi-unit dwellings to respect their context through height restrictions, landscape buffers, and setbacks that are imposed by the Zoning By-Law. The main concerns with permitting more than one main building on a lot pertain to the overcrowding of properties and exceeding lot coverage and density. Given the size of this property and the proposed layout, these concerns are minimized. All other zoning provisions are being respected other than the two variances.

The property is a 5-acre parcel of land on Runneymeade Road, and the proposal is to construct a 55-unit apartment building in the first phase in 2020, with a 71-unit building to be built in the future. The buildings are L-shaped, with the shorter side abutting Runneymeade Road. The property is zoned R3, which permits multiple unit buildings as well as more than one building on a lot. The site plans for the entrances, screenings, accessory buildings, and structures as well as setbacks were presented of the property.

The developer is planning to include two single storey storage garages at the parking entrances to limit the visual impact of the parking area. As well, a third accessory building is being proposed to the rear of the property for the on-site storage of salt for winter maintenance.

The first requested variance is to permit a height of 4m to the third accessory building to accommodate a 10' door which would allow access for larger vehicles. Given that the 6m height maximum is still being met, and the accessory building is located 4.75m from the nearest property, the variance request is considered reasonable and meets the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Law.

The second variance is requested as to the requirement that a multiple unit building have a public entrance facing a street. As the entrance doors do not face the street, technically this would not meet the zoning by-law requirements. However, sidewalks are being provided from the public sidewalk to the main entrances so that pedestrians can access the building from the street as well as an area for bike parking would be provided, the variance request is considered reasonable and meets the general intent of the Municipal and Zoning By-Law.

The adjacent properties are zoned R2 (Two Unit Dwelling) and RM (Residential Mix), and certain screening provisions are required depending on which zone a multi-unit building abuts. As per the Zoning By-law, a 6-metre buffer of trees, shrubs, and a fence is required when abutting an R2 zone. A 3-metre buffer of trees and shrubs is required when abutting an RM zone.

Numerous complaints and concerns were raised from residents regarding the screening provisions for the parking lot as to the impact of headlights shining into the windows. Parking lots abutting a residential zone, a tree buffer is either required with trees planted every 10m or a fence. Discussions occurred with the developer on this matter and it was agreed a fence, in addition to a berm or trees being planted and / or maintaining trees where possible along the eastern part of the parking lot would be more appropriate in this case.

Neighbours within a 60m radius received written notice of the application. Kirk Brewer noted numerous calls, e-mails and petitions were received for this application with concerns about loss of privacy and higher traffic volumes, loss of property value to the area, as well as neighbours felt they were misled about the proposal that was presented from the developer when residents purchased their homes.

The Chair called upon the applicant to address the Committee if they wished to speak on this matter.

Robert LeBlanc, of Moemar Homes, noted the parcel of land on Runneymeade Road was purchased in 2009-2010 and was always zoned for the intention of any future construction of apartment buildings being built on that parcel of land and was always disclosed to prospective buyers who either purchased on Sugarloaf Court and Runneymeade Road. Mr. LeBlanc indicated he would be willing to have discussions with the residents in the area to consider changing the landscape screening to either a berm or trees instead of a fence. Mr. LeBlanc stressed that he would be willing to work with the residents on whatever is practical.

The Chair questioned the applicant concerning snow management considerations for the property.

Mr. LeBlanc mentioned snow removal would be taken care of by their company and if an excess of snow did occur, the snow would be hauled offsite. As well, salt would be stored in the accessory building.

The Chair called upon the members of the public to come forward if they wished to submit comments on this project.

Several residents residing on both Runneymeade Road and Sugarloaf Court presented their comments and expressed their concerns related to the proposed development. They cited the following factors as significant objections to the project.

- a) Loss of privacy for residents on Runneymeade Road and Sugarloaf Court who believe the buffer setback / screening between the apartment buildings and their properties is not sufficient,
- b) Loss of privacy for residents on Coachmen Street, Sugarloaf Court and Hillsdale Ave. as the new site plan and concept now angles the buildings which would have balconies looking down on the backyard of their properties - original site plan indicated the street access and the apartment building would be built along Runneymeade Road,
- c) Public entrances not facing the street changes the whole complexity of the lot to accommodate apartment buildings that should not be in the location,
- d) Increased traffic congestion and parking issues on Runneymeade Road would occur due to multiple apartment buildings,
- e) Location and enclosure of the garbage bin/container as residents questioned with that many apartments what assurances they would have that garbage would not become a serious issue if not stored or collected properly,
- f) No indication in these conditions that would give residents assurances from the developer that there would be no more infringement on their privacy.

Kirk Brewer responded to and clarified the questions and concerns raised by the residents. He noted variances are considered on a case-by-case proposal basis and are only required when something does not meet the requirements of the Zoning By-Law. There are provisions within the by-law that require certain landscaping setbacks depending on the adjacent zones.

As this development abuts a R2 zone, there are height limits if within 12 to 15m and there are provisions if more than 15m. The nearest point of the building is 15.13m, therefore, it does respect the zoning by-law in terms of the setback, which is in place to minimize the impact of having a building too close to the property line.

Kirk Brewer mentioned the fence to the east of the property where it abuts the back yards on Sugarloaf Court was requested by staff to address the impact of headlights shining into windows at night from cars entering and exiting the parking lot. It was considered for the privacy of the apartment balconies.

Kirk Brewer noted the requirement for a public entrance to face the street, in this case the doors do not physically face towards the street but an access is provided near the side of the building that does face the street. These are all rental units with a hallway that runs down the middle of

the building, therefore the entrances are in the middle of the ends of the building. He remarked when discussion had occurred in orienting the building with the long side running along Runneymeade, the building design itself had not changed and the same question would be posed around the public entrance not facing the street. There would be no main door along the long side of the building.

Kirk Brewer confirmed any kind of storage area for the garbage does need to be enclosed and surrounded by a gate of some kind.

Several residents asked if the developer would consider a berm and more trees rather than a 6 ft. fence to guarantee better privacy is put in place for the residents in the area since the positions of the buildings have changed significantly. The residents indicated they would like to see more cooperation from the developer to discuss this option to ensure more privacy for the affected residents.

Kirk Brewer mentioned under the Zoning By-Law, the screening requirements between parking lots and residential zones requires either trees or a fence. Presently, the motion is requiring a fence between the parking area and the rear yards of Sugarloaf Court. If any other option is suggested, such as a berm, it would be up to the developer to decide if it is acceptable. If the developer built a berm with a fence on top or a berm with trees on top, this would meet the conditions of the by-law. However, if the requirement for the fence is removed, it would need to be reflected in the motion that is passed. There is no mention of a berm in the by-law as a requirement and if a fence is no longer a requirement, it would need to be removed from the conditions.

Also, if a berm is discussed, the site plan shows a distance of 5.3m approximately between the rear of the parking area and the back-property line, therefore the site condition would need to be taken into account. If the requirement changes to a 5 or 6 ft. high berm, it would need to be discussed to determine if it is feasible to construct something within that space before such a condition is imposed.

Robert LeBlanc noted the resident's concerns. He mentioned the way the building is now angled would be better for the residents residing on Sugarloaf Court as there would be no balconies facing their backyard. He would be willing to work with the residents to determine if a berm is possible that would create a nice buffer with trees spaced apart on the berm and which would also address the car headlights. However, if a berm is done, subject to their engineer's approval, the fence would be removed.

Mr. LeBlanc noted snow would be removed off site and heavy equipment vehicles would only be used after a storm happens. The accessory building would be a multi-purpose building that would house the salt, but also other equipment and / or accessories needed for the apartment buildings.

The Chair confirmed there were no further questions or comments from residents participating through the online platform.

The following motions were made by the Committee:

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed conditional uses on PID 0093919 to permit more than one main building on a lot, and to permit multiple unit dwellings in an R3 zone subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That a 2-metre-high wood fence be constructed between the eastern boundary of the parking lot and the property bearing PID 05105101,
- 2) That a key lock box be installed per municipal By-law 500-11,
- 3) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction, and
- 4) That the proposed development shall be in substantial conformity with the site plans, elevation drawings and renderings provided.

A motion to AMEND was made by Kelvin Martin and seconded by Tina Beers that the wording in condition 1) be amended to **“That appropriate screening be provided per the Zoning By-Law between the eastern boundary of the parking lot and the property bearing PID 05105101.”**  
**AMENDED MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Moved by Shawn Dempsey and seconded by Art Ball that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance to permit public entrances that do not face a public street because the request is reasonable and meets the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Moved by Kelvin Martin and seconded by Tina Beers that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance to increase the height of an accessory building from 3 metres to 4 metres with a maximum building height of 6 metres because the request is reasonable and meets the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Shawn Dempsey was muted at this point of the virtual meeting on the discussion of this item at 8:05 p.m.

- c) Thierry Comtois (Spitfire Design) on behalf of Erin Lynn Roberts, Hillsborough Road/Allan Street (PID 00642330), To permit a 28-unit multiple unit dwelling as a conditional use in a Residential Mix zone with variances to 1) permit balconies to encroach 0.9m into a landscape buffer, and 2) to waive the requirement of a public entrance facing a street (File 20-386)

Kirk Brewer conducted a presentation on a conditional use for a multi-unit building in a Residential Mix (RM) zone. The original project address was 875 Hillsborough Road but given the changes to the street layout, it was re-designated as 88 Allan Street. Two variances are being considered 1) to allow balconies to encroach 0.9 metres into a landscape buffer, and 2) to permit a public entrance that does not face a street.

The Municipal Plan requires multi-unit dwellings to respect their context through height restrictions, landscape buffers, and setbacks with a limit of 15 units per acre in the RM zone as well are subject to the development standards laid out in the Zoning By-Law as well as any conditions imposed by PAC.

The subject property is abutting the Petitcodiac River. Per the Zoning By-law and provincial regulation, no development is permitted within 30 metres of the watercourse. The building is far outside this buffer, but per the site and drainage plans submitted as part of the application, a portion of the proposed stormwater retention pond may be located within the 30 metres. A stormwater pond is not considered a development requiring a permit under the Zoning by-law, so no variance is required. However, a wetland and watercourse alteration permit would be required from the Department of Environment and Local Government for any work conducted in this area.

The surrounding subdivision was created in the 1950s and a portion of Allan Street has been left as an undeveloped stub street but is in the Town's public right of way and has sat idle for many years. The concern is if granting access to a stub street such as this, it may interfere with future connectivity.

The Town's Engineering Department and Fire Department have both reviewed the plans and are comfortable that it meets safety requirements, though the Fire Department has requested that the emergency vehicle turnaround be left unobstructed and clearly marked. Further, no future connection is planned across this property, and the property maintenance outside the public right of way would be the responsibility of the property owner so no temporary turnaround is required. However, based on the site design, there remains the possibility to upgrade the parking lot to public road standards in the future to create a connection to the south. At that time, a temporary turnaround would be required on the adjacent property to the south.

A 6-metre-wide landscaping buffer comprised of trees, shrubs, and an opaque fence is required between the building and adjacent R1 zones. Based on the plans submitted, this requirement can be met and still accommodate the proposed drainage system. However, the proposed building design includes balconies on both sides of the building. To the north, these balconies would encroach 0.9 m into the landscape buffer. The Zoning By-law allows balconies to encroach 2 metres into a required yard (i.e. the building setback line), and states that the landscape buffer shall not be used for parking, garbage storage or public utilities. However, it is silent on balcony encroachments into landscape buffers.

Based on this gray area, SERSC felt it was prudent to treat this request as a variance from the By-law requirements. Considering that the balconies would be permitted as proposed within the building setback, and that the landscaping requirements can still be met, this request is considered to be reasonable and within the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law.

A second variance is requested to waive the requirement for a public entrance facing a street. This is a flag lot and the building would be located more than 60 metres from Hillsborough Road, which would not be used as an access. Allan Street does not continue across the subject property, so in this case it is impossible to meet this requirement since there is no public street abutting the building. For this reason, the request to waive this requirement is reasonable and within the intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-law.

Notices were sent to neighbouring property owners within 60m of the subject property on April 29, 2020. Several calls, emails and petitions were received from residents in the area expressing their comments and concerns related to loss of privacy, speeding and traffic volumes on Hillsborough Road were raised as safety issues, present road condition of Garland Street, potential eagle's nest on the property, loss of property values, and inappropriate location for this type of development.

Art Ball and Keith Whalen mentioned as Committee members during the review of the Municipal Plan several years ago, one of the main concerns discussed was the encroachment of buildings on other existing properties. The intent of those discussions was to establish a larger landscape buffer zone between properties from what was in the Municipal Plan at the time and to date it has been quite successful. Both were not in agreement with having the balconies encroach in the landscape buffer as it did not meet the intent of what the Municipal Plan had envisioned.

Keith Whalen also noted, in his opinion, the building does not fit in the location as presented; and therefore, he could not support the requested variance.

Kirk Brewer explained the building set back is 6m from the property line, and according to the Zoning By-Law, the balcony can encroach up to 2m into the building set back. In the by-law, there is no mention if the landscape buffer has the same status as a building set back and how those two pieces inter play.

Discussion also ensued on whether the location of the building could be reversed to have the property line further to the east and have the parking lot facing the residential properties as it would give the properties a larger buffer. Kirk Brewer noted questions were raised as to which would be best for the residents, the loss of privacy due to windows or the loss of privacy due to increased traffic.

The Chair called upon the applicant to address the Committee should they wish to speak on this project.

Julien Daigle of Daigle Engineering confirmed with Tina Beers that there is a plateau at the center of the building and does sit lower than the adjacent properties. The French drainage system would catch the runoff and would not drain on neighbouring properties.

The Chair called upon the members of the public to come forward if they wished to submit comments on the proposed development.

Several residents residing on Garland Drive, Allan Street and Hillsborough Road, presented their comments and concerns on the proposed apartment building development. The residents expressed the following concerns and objections with the development:

- a) Safety issues of increased traffic that would occur on Garland Drive, Allan Street and Hillsborough Road and that Garland Street is a narrow street with no sidewalks,
- b) Safety issues for children that would catch the school bus at the top of Garland,
- c) Traffic flow issues that would occur on Garland Drive as there would be no safe entry or exit from any angle to get onto Hillsborough Road,
- d) Speeding issues on Hillsborough Road whereby people do not respect the speed limit as well as the turning lane going into Garland Drive being used as a passing lane,
- e) The size of the proposed 28-unit apartment building and site location should be considered as residents felt the development would not be best suited for this area.

Residents asked the Committee to reconsider not allowing the proposed apartment building development being built within proximity of their properties as well as to notably take into consideration all the safety and traffic issues and concerns that were noted and brought forward by the residents in the related area.

Mr. Billo Diallo, the developer of the proposed project, mentioned he would like to see his first investment built in Riverview and was looking forward to building a development that would be affordable for seniors and young professionals. Mr. Diallo would be very open to work with the neighbourhood to make sure all practical conditions would be considered on this project.

The following motions were made by the Committee:

Moved by Robert Bailey and seconded by Tina Beers that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed multiple unit dwelling as a conditional use on PID 00642330 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) that prior to issuing development and building permits, the developer enter into an agreement with the Town of Riverview with respect to the scheduling and construction standards of an access within the public right of way (Allan Street)
- 2) that no snow storage be permitted within the emergency vehicle turnaround, and that a “No Parking - Fire Lane” sign be erected in the area reserved for the emergency vehicle turnaround as shown on the site plan dated April 22, 2020
- 3) that a key lock box be installed per municipal By-law 500-11
- 4) that as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction
- 5) that the proposed development shall be in substantial conformity with the site plans, elevation drawings and renderings provided.
- 6) that a Wetland and Watercourse Alteration permit be obtained for any work related to the stormwater pond within the 30-metre watercourse buffer.

**Nay Vote: Keith Whalen**

**MOTION CARRIED**

Moved by Keith Whalen and seconded by Kelvin Martin that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee DENY the requested variance to permit balconies to encroach 0.9 metres within a landscape buffer because the request is not reasonable or within the general intent of the Municipal Plan and Zoning By-Law.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Moved by Kelvin Martin and seconded by Robert Bailey that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the request to waive the requirement for a public entrance facing a street because due to site conditions the requirement can not be met.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Shawn Dempsey returned to the virtual meeting at 9:29 p.m.

- d) Eric Hopper on behalf of the Town of Riverview, 175 Hillsborough Road (PID 05034574), To permit a sea can as a temporary accessory use for up to one year (File 20-460)

Kirk Brewer mentioned the application is from the Town of Riverview to permit a sea can / shipping container as a temporary accessory structure for up to a year. The Zoning By-law prohibits the use of sea cans as accessory structures because they are often considered unsightly, particularly in residential areas, and contribute little to no value to a property.

However, due to the Covid-19 situation, the Town is seeking to ensure physical distancing among employees, particularly in the department of Parks, Recreation and Community Relations, by moving certain equipment to an alternate storage site on a municipally-owned property along the Riverfront Trail during the summer maintenance season in order to spread out workers and avoid congregating at a single location each day.

Given the unusual circumstances this year, it is reasonable to permit the temporary use of this type of structure to ensure that parks, sports fields, and other recreational facilities can be maintained by storing equipment in a structure which is easily removed at the end of the term. The sea can must still respect all other provisions of the By-law including setbacks for accessory buildings and must be removed within one year of PAC approval.

Notices were sent to neighbouring property owners within 60m of the subject property on April 29, 2020. Calls were received for information, but no objections were raised.

The following motion was made by the Committee:

Moved by Art Ball and seconded by Keith Whalen that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the request to permit a sea can as a temporary accessory structure on PID 05034574 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) that the sea can meet the required setbacks for accessory buildings; and
- 2) that the sea can be removed from the property prior to May 13, 2021.

Robert Bailey was not in agreement with the proposal to permit the sea can structure to be placed at the mentioned location. He felt the structure would be an eye sore and noted since copper wiring had already been stolen off Gunningsville Blvd. recently, he felt that items or equipment stored in the container could also be taken.

**Nay Vote: Robert Bailey**  
**MOTION CARRIED**

## **7. TENTATIVE SUBDIVISIONS**

NIL

## **8. BY-LAW AMENDMENTS, ZONING AND MUNICIPAL PLAN MATTERS**

NIL

## **9. OTHER BUSINESS**

NIL

## **10. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

To be determined.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Shawn Dempsey. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.