



MEETING MINUTES

Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee
Wednesday, December 8, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, Riverview Town Hall

Attendance: Tina Beers, Chair
Daniel Primeau, 2nd Vice Chair
Kelvin Martin, Committee Member
Bob Riley, Committee Member
John Trainor, Committee Member
Debby Warren, Committee Member
Lori Bickford, Planning Manager, SE Regional Service Commission
Kirk Brewer, Planner, SE Regional Service Commission
Candace Mann, Executive Assistant, Town of Riverview

Regrets: Shawn Dempsey, 1st Vice Chair
Rob Bateman, Committee Member
Myriam Mekni, Committee Member

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Tina Beers, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

NIL

3. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

Moved by John Trainor and seconded by Kelvin Martin

That the agenda for the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of December 8, 2021, be APPROVED.

MOTION CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

a) Planning Advisory Committee Meeting - September 8, 2021

Moved by Bob Riley and seconded by Daniel Primeau

That the minutes of the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of September 8, 2021, be ADOPTED.

MOTION CARRIED

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

NIL

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

6a) Simon Ikuseru, 353 Pine Glen Road (PID 05052543), Conditional use application to permit a 4-unit row house with variances to:

- 1) Reduce the driveway location setback from a side lot line from 3m to 2m
- 2) Reduce the landscaping requirements where a commercial zone abuts a residential zone

K. Brewer began his presentation by outlining that the subject property is classified as a commercial zone, but does allow residential uses. The adjacent lots are zoned as R3, and there are R2 semi-detached homes on Glenview Court, as well as a school to rear that is zoned as Parks, Recreational and Institutional Use.

The site plan illustrates the infill lot as being of irregular shape. The proposed site plan shows the row house to be set away from Pine Glen Road with the driveway being at a 2m setback to the southern property line. The property will have six parking spaces, which meets the one space per unit requirement under the by-law. There is a privacy fence along the southern and western property lines where it abuts the lower density uses. Landscaping will be provided at the rear of the property, per the by-law.

Given the site constraints, the developer is proposing a 2m driveway location setback to the side lot line in order to meet the width of 6.7m for a two-way driveway. The 3m setback largely relates to commercial uses where traffic volume is high. When reviewed, Engineering did not deem this variance to be of concern. The property will be a low density residential use with only six parking spaces, which is not expected to impact traffic greatly.

The northern part of the property abuts an R3 zone; which requires trees, shrubs and/or fencing in the 3m landscaping area. The 3m setback is being met, although the drainage plan incorporates drain tile in this area which makes landscaping and fencing difficult. The commercial landscaping requirements are in place to protect adjacent existing uses from new commercial development. This property will be residential use next to a multi-unit residential use, therefore, removing the landscaping provisions is reasonable.

The 4-unit row house will contain two bedroom units, two stories high with second story balconies. The two facades, as well as the elevation facing Pine Glen Road, will meet the traditional material requirements for town houses.

There is a crosswalk in proximity to the project and during the development review the Engineers did not anticipate any safety concerns given the low traffic volumes as the town house will only have 6 parking spaces. Given that Pine Glen Road is one of the major collector roads, it is capable of handling the proposed increase in traffic. This application was also discussed among Planners, Development Officers and the Development Review Committee (Planning, CAO/Clerk, Engineering, Economic Development, Parks and Fire Department) and no concerns were raised as part of this review.

Written public notices were sent to the neighbours within a 60m radius and the feedback from neighbours related to: concerns with traffic and the nearby crosswalk, loss of property value, loss of trees and snow maintenance. Property assessments as it relates to property value is Service New Brunswick's jurisdiction and not that of the Town. The loss of trees is unavoidable with any development but it is noted there will be landscaping provided on site. With regard to snow maintenance, there is a 6m setback at the rear of the property which will provide ample room for snow storage. Often if snow on site does get excessive the property owner will have it hauled away.

John Abedisi, a representative for the applicant, clarified the concern regarding snow maintenance stating the property owner will be managing snow removal and the tenants will not be responsible for snow maintenance. K. Brewer also explained the row house will be classified as a residential development and the waste management would be curbside pick-up and not communal dumpsters.

Katherine Loughery, a nearby resident, outlined concerns and expressed her opposition on the development. Among her concerns were waste management, salt leaching, grading issues, and trees being removed. Additionally, she was concerned the fence was not high enough to offer privacy from her deck and that it is being built 0.5m from her property line.

T. Beers inquired if the proposed fence was in accordance with the by-laws. K. Brewer explained the reason why the fence is not directly on the developer's property line is because K. Loughery's shed is encroaching on the proposed property. He went on to note that maintenance should not be an issue, as most maintenance can be done from the other side of the fence.

K. Martin stated that this lot has been discussed in the past, and that due to the size of the lot this development may be too big. He also expressed concerned with the variances that could potentially impact the residents on Glenview Court. K. Brewer explained that the property is zoned for this development and if this land were to be zoned for residential mix these variances wouldn't be required. He went on to note that even if the proposed building was smaller, the variance would be likely still be required due to the irregular lot shape.

D. Primeau mirrored these sentiments and stated that the lot is too small for a development of this size. K. Brewer reiterated the only reason these variances are required is because this development is a residential building in a commercial zone. If the zone was residential only these variances would not be required. D. Primeau asked for clarification on the height of the fence versus the height of the decks belonging to the neighbours abutting the development. K. Brewer explained the decks are raised up, making the fence about 3 feet below their view from the deck.

Robert Heudes, a nearby resident, addressed concerns in regard to elevation and drainage. K. Brewer explained that this development needs to meet zero net drainage requirements, which means the run-off post development needs to match what it is pre-development. The developer is required to provide a drainage plan. Approval from the Engineering Department will be required before the project begins.

The following motions were made by the Committee:

MOTION 1

Moved by John Trainor and seconded by Bob Riley

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the conditional use application to permit a four-unit row house on the property bearing PID 05052543, known as 353 Pine Glen Road, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction; and
- (2) That the proposed development shall be in substantial conformity with the site plans and elevation drawings provided.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION 2

Moved by Kelvin Martin and seconded by Daniel Primeau

Motion to Amend:

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee DENY the variance request to reduce the driveway location setback from a side lot line from 3m to 2m on the property bearing PID 05052543 (353 Pine Glen Road) because the development is too large for the lot.

Nays: John Trainor, Bob Riley, Debby Warren, Tina Beers

MOTION DENIED

Moved by Bob Riley and seconded by Debby Warren

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance request to reduce the driveway location setback from a side lot line from 3m to 2m on the property bearing PID 05052543 (353 Pine Glen Road) because the driveway location is reasonable due to site constraints and there being no foreseeable conflict between the access and the adjacent residential property.

Nays: Kelvin Martin, Daniel Primeau

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION 3

Moved by Bob Riley and seconded by John Trainor

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance request to reduce the landscaping requirements where a commercial zone abuts a residential zone on PID 05052543 (353 Pine Glen Road) because the request is reasonable due to site and drainage constraints, as well as there being privacy screening between the proposed use and the adjacent row house.

MOTION CARRIED

7. TENTATIVE SUBDIVISIONS

NIL

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

NIL

9. OTHER BUSINESS

T. Beers welcomed new member, Debby Warren to the committee.

B. Riley advised the committee that this would be his last Planning Advisory Committee Meeting, as he will be resigning. T. Beers thanked him for his time and contribution to the committee.

10. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

The date for the next scheduled meeting is January 12, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Debby Warren. Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.



Tina Beers, Chair