

MEETING MINUTES
Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee
Wednesday, February 12, 2025
Council Chambers

Attendance: Shawn Dempsey, Chair
 Daniel Primeau, 1st Vice Chair
 Rob Bateman, Committee Member
 Kevin Steen, Committee Member
 Rebecca Laffoley, Committee Member
 Debby Warren, Committee Member
 Chris Whalen, Committee Member
 Kyle Lewis, Committee Member
 Shauna McGraw, Executive Assistant, Town of Riverview
 Lori Bickford, Planning Manager, SE Regional Service Commission
 Sam Gerrand, Planner, SE Regional Service Commission
 Jenna Stewart, Planner, SE Regional Service Commission
 Jeff Boudreau, Planner, SE Regional Service Commission

Regrets: Susan Steeves, Committee Member

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Shawn Dempsey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Chris Whalen declared a Conflict of Interest for items 6a and 7b

3. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the agenda for the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of February 12, 2025 be APPROVED taking into the account the note made by S. McGraw that the items under Section 7 have been flipped so that the original item 7a is now item 7b and the original item 7b is now item 7a.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Planning Advisory Committee Meeting – December 11, 2024

Moved by K. Steen and seconded by R. Laffoley

That the minutes of the Town of Riverview Planning Advisory Committee meeting of November 14, 2024, be ADOPTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

NIL

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

C. Whalen left the meeting due to the declared conflict at 6:03 pm

a) Jamie Shea, Sheaco Management Inc (PID #05123146, 05087440). Conditional Use application to permit mini-storage warehouse use in the Suburban Commercial (SC) zone, multiple main buildings on a lot, and a commercial use exceeding 1,500m², in a SC zone; Variance to reduce the required parking stalls from 100 to 36 stalls. (File 24-1908 and 24-1987)

Presented by S. Gerrand. The applicant is proposing an expansion to their existing self-storage business which would include a new single-storey office building with an attached two-storey indoor storage facility and 10 separate mini-storage warehouses.

The property has split zoning with the front portion zoned Industrial (I) zone and the rear portion zoned Suburban Commercial (SC). It is neighbored by additional SC and I properties.

In 2012 PAC approved a conditional use request to have more than one building on the lot. Additionally, in 2024 they obtained a building permit to complete the final phase of the first phase with 3 additional mini-storage warehouses.

The new expansion proposed by the applicant is located on both the Industrial and Suburban Commercial portions of the lot. The office and attached indoor storage facility are proposed on the front portion of the lot and are permitted uses of the I zone. The proposed additional 10 mini-storage warehouses are located on the rear portion of the lot, zoned SC, and are a conditional use of the zone. Additionally, a conditional use is required to allow multiple main buildings on a lot and to permit a commercial space larger than 1,500 sqm on the SC portion of the lot.

As well, a parking variance is required because required parking spaces based on the size of the building would be 100 spaces but considering the nature of the business and size of actual office space it was determined that 35 spaces would be sufficient.

The proposal was reviewed by the Town's Development Review Team and no issues were raised. As well notice was sent to landowners within 60m with no responses received.

Motion 1

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the conditional use in the SC zone on PID 05123146 to permit the development of 10 mini-storage warehouses buildings subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That a 3m wide landscaping buffer is provided along the south and west property lines as shown on the attached site plan.
- (2) That development proceed in substantial conformity with the attached site plan.
- (3) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 2

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the conditional use application for multiple buildings on a lot on PID 05123146, 05087440 to permit the development of an office building with attached 2-story storage warehouse and 10 mini-storage warehouses buildings subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That a 3m wide landscaping buffer is provided along the south and west property lines as shown on the attached site plan.
- (2) That development proceed in substantial conformity with the attached site plan as well as building and elevation drawings.
- (3) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction.

Moved by K. Steen and seconded by R. Laffoley

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 3

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the conditional use application for a commercial use greater than 1,500 square meters on PID 05123146, 05087440 to permit the development of an office building with attached 2 storey storage warehouse and 10 mini-storage warehouses buildings subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That a 3m wide landscaping buffer is provided along the south and west property lines as shown on the attached site plan.
- (2) That development proceed in substantial conformity with the attached site plan as well as building and elevation drawings.
- (3) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction

Moved by D. Primeau and seconded by K. Lewis

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 4

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed variance to reduce the number of required parking stalls from 100 stalls to 35 stalls as per the attached site plan.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by R. Laffoley

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Whalen returned to the meeting at 6:21 pm

b) Maurice LeBlanc, MoeMar Homes (PID #05122585). Conditional Use application to permit a four-unit townhouse in the Residential Mix (RM) zone; variance to reduce the required rear yard setback from 6m to 3.23m and a variance to reduce the required separation distance of a driveway from a street line from 11m to 8.93m. (File 24-1536 and 25-0041)

Sam Gerrand presented the proposal explaining that this is a conditional use application that is part of the Carriage Hills Subdivision secondary plan that was approved by Council in 2013. He confirmed that this parcel was identified in that plan as designated for townhouse development.

Additionally, a variance approval is required to reduce the rear yard setback from 6m to 3.23m and a second to reduce the driveway separation from the street line from 11m to 8.93m.

The setback variance comes into play because this is a corner lot so what is normally viewed as the rear yard is in this case the side yard and the side yard is the rear yard.

For the driveway variance it is acknowledged that although it is less than the 11m requirement to the edge of the property (8.93m) it is over the minimum to the edge of the curb (14.16m).

The Town's Development Team reviewed the proposal with no concerns and a notice was sent to landowners within 60m with one letter received which raised concerns about privacy and property value.

D. Primeau asked when the RM zone was created for the subject lot. S. Gerrand confirmed it has been RM since the subdivision plan was implemented in 2013.

S. Gerrand confirmed to R. Laffoley that the 14+m was from the driveway to the actual roadway while the requirement is the distance to the property line be 11m.

Motion 1

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed conditional use on PID 05122585 to permit a townhouse in an RM zone subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the project be developed in substantial conformity with the attached site plan and elevation drawings.
- (2) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 2

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed variance to reduce the required rear yard setback from 6m to 3.23m.

Moved by K. Steen and C. Whalen

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 3

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed variance to reduce the required distance between a residential driveway and a street line from 11m to 8.93m.

Moved by R. Laffoley and seconded by K. Lewis

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

c) Maurice LeBlanc, Moemar Homes (PID #05122593). Conditional Use application to permit a four-unit townhouse in the Residential Mix (RM) zone; variance to reduce the required rear yard setback from 6m to 3.25m and a variance to reduce the required separation distance of a driveway to a street line from 11m to 9.04m. (File 24-1982 and 25-0042)

Sam Gerrand explained that this file is very similar to last item given that it is on the adjacent lot.

In this case the setback variances are for a rear yard setback of 3.25m from the required 6m and the required driveway separation from 11m to 9.04m.

The Town's Development Team reviewed with no comments and the same letter of opposition was received.

S. Gerrand confirmed to D. Primeau that originally this property was to have a 3-unit townhouse but that was amended to 4 properties at the time of this proposal being initiated, however, it still meets zoning standards. Additionally, he confirmed that the house immediately behind this property is a two-storey semi-detached unit.

Motion 1

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed conditional use on PID 05122593 to permit a townhouse in an RM zone subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the project be developed in substantial conformity with the attached site plan and elevation drawings.
- (2) That as-built drawings for engineering submissions shall be required within 30 days after construction.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 2

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed variance to reduce the required rear yard setback from 6m to 3.25m.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 3

Staff recommend that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the proposed variance to reduce the required distance between a residential driveway and a street line from 11m to 9.04m.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

d) Joe Greer, AGCM (PID #05123005). Variance request to increase the maximum height from 15m to 15.55m for a multiple unit dwelling in the Suburban Commercial (SC) zone. (File 25-0039)

Jenna Stewart provided details on this variance request in the SC zone explaining that this proposal was first reviewed by the PAC in March of 2024 when approval for conditional use and two variance applications was given based. Those conditions remain in place today. She noted as well that one of the conditions was that they consolidate into a single lot which they have since done. This request is for a new variance to extend beyond the 15m maximum height in the SC zone due to the fact that once the plans were completed including 9' ceilings in the apartments their overall height moved to 15.55m to accommodate the ceiling height and hvac and plumbing needs.

The Town's Development Team reviewed the request without issues and notices were sent to landowners within 60m with no comments received.

Applicant was present but didn't feel that they needed to address the committee.

Motion

Staff respectfully recommends that the Planning Advisory Committee APPROVE the variance request to increase the maximum height from 15m to 15.55m for a multiple unit dwelling in the SC zone on the property bearing PID 05123005 as it is reasonable; within the intent of the Municipal Plan; and the impact is anticipated to be minimal in nature on the surrounding area when compared to the permitted height of 15m.

Moved by K. Lewis and seconded by D. Primeau

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. TENTATIVE SUBDIVISIONS

a) Hub Surveys (PID# 05043427, 05043336, 05020201, 05123252). Request for PAC views on the Mitton Road Subdivision . (File 24-1935)

Jenna Stewart provided some detail on the file indicating that the road is located almost at the West end of the service boundary of the Town. She indicated that the land surrounding it is zoned Rural Area and/or Open Spaces. She noted as well that much of the land is provincially owned although the authority for management of the streets was transferred to the Town through an order of Council in 1982. Additionally, it is important to note that this is a project directed by the Town of Riverview and therefore no subdivision agreement is required as part of the approval process.

The Tentative Mitton Road subdivision is a Type 2 subdivision. A recommendation from the PAC to council is one of the required steps to bring this proposed Type 2 subdivision plan to council for their final assent.

The tentative Mitton Road Subdivision Plan outlines that its purpose is to create a portion of Mitton Road as a circular turn around area that would act as the new end of Mitton Road.

J. Stewart added that a WAWA (Watercourse and Wetland Alteration) permit was obtained by the Town for this project.

Motion

Staff respectfully recommends that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee recommend the Town of Riverview council assent to the creation of a portion of Mitton Road as shown on the Mitton Road subdivision plan by Hub Surveys with Job-#24-068 from 2024.

Moved by D. Warren and seconded by C. Whalen

That the motion be approved as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Whalen left the meeting due to his conflict for the next item at 6:51 pm

b) Dale Briggs, Cox and Palmer (PID# 05108808). Subdivision exemption request. (File 24-1990 and File 25-0014)

Jeff Boudreau presented the file for consideration. This is for a subdivision exemption and typically they would not come before the committee for approval; they are at the discretion of the development officer to approve the exemption. However, there is a clause that the development officer can refuse an exemption with the consent of the Planning Advisory Committee under certain circumstances.

The property is near Gunningsville Blvd and abutting Bridgedale Blvd. They are seeking an exemption to divide the property into three properties; two south of Bridgedale and one north of Bridgedale creating three separate PID's. It was noted that there are provincially mapped wetlands and watercourses that run through the property. He noted that the subject property and surrounding areas include a mix of zoning including RM, CM, Open Space, etc.

J. Boudreau explained that under the Community Planning Act section 80(2) a development officer may refuse to grant an exemption if, in the development officer's opinion and in the opinion of the advisory committee the proposed exemption is undesirable for the development of the land or the neighboring land, or it is not in keeping with the general intent of the Act or a by-law under this Act.

Also, the Town of Riverview Subdivision bylaw indicates that the development officer shall not approve a plan if in their opinion and in the opinion of the Committee the land is not suited to the purpose it is intended or may not reasonably be expected to be used for that purpose within a reasonable time after the subdivision plan is approved or the proposed manner of subdividing will prejudice the possibility of further subdividing the land or the convenient subdividing of adjoining land. He noted that there is a third reason which is the subdivision contravenes the currently adopted version of the building codes but that is really only relevant to the subdivision of buildings and not relevant to this situation.

J. Boudreau explained that the real issue is in relation to this policy under the Commercial Mix zone that speaks directly to this area of land:

To ensure that the large undeveloped Commercial Mix (CM) node, located at the western portion of Bridgedale Boulevard, where it intersects with Gunningsville Boulevard, is developed in a coordinated manner that is consistent with the Plan, developers, in cooperation with the Town of Riverview and the Committee, will need to provide a secondary plan to guide the overall development of these lands.
Policy 7.2.3

Then the next policy 7.2.4. that reads:

To assist with the implementation of Policy 7.2.3, Council will consider the following objectives when evaluating the secondary plan:

(a) the plan provides an appropriate amount of mix uses which may include commercial, community, medium to high-density residential and small portions of low density residential located on local streets;

(b) the efficient layout of streets and traffic in general;

- (c) the potential to minimize the number of driveways serving developments and to encourage the development of shared access;*
- (d) quality urban design, landscaping, and streetscaping;*
- (e) the connectivity with adjacent lands;*
- (f) the provision of appropriate pedestrian, transit and cycling infrastructure to accommodate alternate modes of transportation;*
- (g) detailed servicing and infrastructure information; and*
- (h) any other applicable information.*

J. Boudreau added that it is important to note that Bridgedale Blvd is a Controlled Access Road and so there are specific requirements to such:

2(1) No person shall construct, use, open or permit the use of any access to any part of a street designed as a controlled access street in Schedule "A."

2(2) Notwithstanding subsection 2(1), a new access shall be permitted onto a controlled access street provided it is separated by at least 200 meters centerline to centerline from another street or access.

2(3) Any development on property abutting a controlled access street shall be prohibited, if in the opinion of the Committee, it would interfere in any way with the use of such controlled access street.

Schedule A

1) Gunningsville Boulevard, with the exception of:

-in addition to the current Dickey Boulevard intersection, one right-in and right-out access, on the south side of the boulevard, located between 180m and 190m east of the centerline of the Pine Glen Road intersection.

2) Bridgedale Boulevard

3) Findlay Boulevard

Staff consulted internally and with Town staff and they did not object to staff's position.

J. Boudreau added that the Municipal Plan requires that this area is developed in a coordinated manner through the establishment of a secondary plan and that no secondary plan for the area has been approved by council.

A secondary plan is required within this sector of Riverview due to a number of factors that effect coordination of development actions including:

- The property is subject to a controlled access by-law, requiring 200 m separation between access points.
- The location of new access will impact adjacent properties, potentially restricting their access options and future development plans.
- Wetlands further complicate road planning.
- Subdividing property into additional lots and increasing the number of owners increases the risk of conflicting development visions and hinders appropriate development of the area.

J. Boudreau indicated that public notice is not required for the approval of refusal of a subdivision exemption request so none was done.

The applicant's representative, Dale Briggs, addressed the Committee as agent for the landowner.

D. Briggs indicated that this application is not to subdivide the land since that was done when the Town created Robertson St and Bridgedale Blvd. What they are asking is that we recognize an existing condition which is the natural boundaries of the land that the roads created. He added that the application is not about developing the land but about selling the land – It is about who owns it not what the owner(s) do with it. Any development would still be held to the zoning bylaws and/or a secondary plan like any other property in that area.

He indicated that his understanding of the role of the Committee is to control development of land not ownership of land. He quoted the staff report that reads "subdividing the property into additional lots and increasing the number of owners increases the risk of conflicting development visions and hinders the appropriate planning of the area." D. Briggs added that yes it may create more owners but those owners will still have to satisfy all the requirements of development. He feels ownership is irrelevant to this application and it should be irrelevant to the Committee. The owner of the land makes no

difference – . He quoted The Community Planning Act section 80(2) that reads “the development of the land” and indicated that the Committee should only be considering the development of the land not the ownership of the land. He feels that to get into the ownership of the land is outside the jurisdiction of the committee.

He added that what the Committee is being asked to do is we won’t exempt the piece of property because there are going to be more owners – not because it will impede development, but because there will be more owners and he feels that is not the role of the Committee.

D. Briggs pointed out that they would agree to go back to one lot south of Bridgedale. The streets become the physical boundary necessary for subdivision of land.

R. LaFolley asked to view the visual again. D. Primeau inquired if he understood the situation – as he sees it the applicant’s land was one PID that was split by means of the road development into three parcels which they now want to formally subdivide but staff oppose it until a proper development plan is in place. J. Boudreau clarified that they are reflecting policy of the Municipal Plan that says the prior to development of the lands a secondary plan needs to be in place. D. Primeau further asked if the fact that the land is divided in three cause prejudice to future supervision, authority or regulations. S. Dempsey added another level to the question – since Mr. Briggs commented on ownership versus development, S. Dempsey would like to know J. Boudreau’s comment on that aspect. J. Boudreau advised that ownership is not in question, he is free to transfer ownership of the land and there would be no implications but the creation of additional owners. The creation of additional lots is no different than creating a subdivision you have to go through the process and at face value they meet the individual criteria of 80(2) in that they are over 5 acres, are separated by a public road, have 150m of width but in this case there is the additional caveat that it must follow Municipal Plan policies that speaks directly to the development of the lands as whole and so that is the issue. There was a lot of conversation internally whether it should be decided solely at their level or whether it should be brought to the Committee to allow a public process, to allow the applicant to make their presentation, etc. for consultation and debate.

D. Primeau reiterated his question whether there are three owners or one owner who does that prejudice the oversight or supervision of SERSC and PAC when it comes to the development of the land. J. Boudreau advised that the way it is worded right now you need each individual owner to sign off on the secondary plan and having more owners increases the likelihood of not being able to get signoff.

S. Dempsey asked if it comes down to dealing with possibility of dealing with three owners rather than one owner that staff sees as a problem. J. Boudreau clarified that it’s more than that – yes there is the agreement of all parties to the secondary plan but also that the controlled access is a significant factor – each parcel needs to be coordinated to ensure that neighboring land is not prejudiced which is easier to do when dealt with as a whole rather than numerous owners. The policy is worded “that the large undeveloped commercial mixed node” located at the western portion of Bridgedale Blvd – it speaks to the whole area not individual parcels being a priority for Council to ensure when it gets developed it is developed in a coordinated fashion.

J. Boudreau confirmed to S. Dempsey that two lots instead of three lots as suggested earlier by Mr. Briggs is just something that they try to avoid because saying it is okay for one is equal to saying it is ok for 5 or 21.

D. Briggs added that the “controlled access” is only existing today because the current landowner conveyed the property to the Town to create those roads. This controlled access is now going to tie his hands for selling the property. He confirmed to R. LaFolley that his client owned the land before the roads were developed.

L. Bickford confirmed to D. Primeau that when the policy was written that discusses a secondary plan that is a common tool that is implemented in land use planning when you have an area that doesn’t have a predetermined “use” for larger pieces of land where you want to have efficient road networks and services but it is not clearly identified at the time. The purpose of the secondary plan is to ensure that is achieved.

S. Dempsey asked L. Bickford to comment on the argument that we are not dealing with development

today – She clarified that the only reason to create lots is for development.

L. Bickford added that with respect to controlled access – Riverview does have a number of controlled access roads and they are an important piece of the secondary plan to ensure the future road network is in the appropriate location.

She confirmed to S. Dempsey that the secondary plan would still be required whether this was one, two or three parcels of land.

L. Bickford further confirmed to D. Primeau that regardless of the number of parcels it would still need to abide by the controlled access by-law and the Municipal Plan policy of a secondary plan requirement. D. Primeau stated his understanding is that as the Control access bylaw and secondary plan is still required before development could occur, splitting this property into 2 or 3 lots or leaving it as one does not change any opportunity or cause prejudice implementation of the controlled access bylaw or secondary plan. These bylaws still need to be respected.

K. Steen asked if anyone had any understanding of any contrary usage that might impede future use and J. Boudreau confirmed that they haven't seen anything one way or another.

J. Boudreau confirmed to D. Warren that the initial concept was the preplanning would be developer driven and as a whole with the other landowners but he recognized that after 10 years or so with nothing happening sooner or later someone is going to have to make a decision and he acknowledged that Council could decide to take this on but haven't to date.

Motion

Staff respectfully recommends that the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee refuse the exemptions presented as they are not in keeping with the general intent of the Community Planning Act or a by-law under the Act, specifically the requirement that a secondary plan be approved by council to ensure the future development of the lands proceeds in a coordinated manner.

Moved by D. Warren

That the motion be approved as written

No seconder was received, motion failed.

A new motion was proposed by D. Primeau to read:

That the Riverview Planning Advisory Committee direct the development officer to grant the exemptions.

Seconded by K. Lewis

MOTION CARRIED – Nay vote: D. Warren

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

C. Whalen returned to the meeting at 7:45 pm

Nil

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Election of Officers – Chair, 1st Vice Chair and 2nd Vice Chair

Chair S. Dempsey asked Lori Bickford, Planning Manager of Plan 360 to chair this portion of the meeting.

L. Bickford called for nominations for the Chair position. D. Primeau nominated S. Dempsey. S. Dempsey consented to his name standing for consideration. L. Bickford called two additional times for nominations and when hearing none, called for a vote. Vote was in unanimous favor of S. Dempsey for Chair.

L. Bickford called for nominations for the 1st Vice Chair position. S. Dempsey nominated D. Primeau. D. Primeau consented to his name standing for consideration. L. Bickford called two additional times for nominations and when hearing none, called for a vote. Vote was in unanimous favor of D. Primeau for 1st Vice Chair.

L. Bickford called for nominations for the 2nd Vice Chair position. S. Dempsey nominated Rob Bateman. R. Bateman consented to his name standing for consideration. L. Bickford called two additional times for nominations and when hearing none, called for a vote. Vote was in unanimous favor of R. Bateman for 2nd Vice Chair.

Following the election of officers L. Bickford turned the meeting back to Chair S. Dempsey.

10. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

The date for the next scheduled meeting is Wednesday, March 12, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by D. Warren that the meeting be adjourned at 8:12 pm


Shawn Dempsey