



**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT
JUNE 23, 2021
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Members Present: Steve Trotter, Chair
Jay Dolan, Member
Marc Pumple, Member

Staff Present: Tiffany Thompson, Manager of Growth and Development
Carlissa McLaren, Supervisor of Planning
Madeline Kowalchuk, Planner
Janice Sadgrove, Secretary-Treasurer

Next Meeting: July 28, 2021, at 5:00 p.m., Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT – POTENTIAL PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were none.

3. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL/ADJOURNMENT

There were none.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Committee of Adjustment hearing held on May 26, 2021, were adopted as circulated.

**Motioned by: Jay Dolan, Member
Second: Marc Pumple, Member
CARRIED**

5. STATUTORY PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5. (a) MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION:** A30/21 – 34 Queen Street
APPLICANT: Small Dwellings Inc. c/o Justin Sherry on behalf of Nick Leonienco

This application, if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit an increased accessory lot coverage for the construction of the detached accessory dwelling unit.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. A maximum accessory lot coverage of 12.4%, whereas comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, Section 5.3.5(h), permits a maximum accessory lot coverage of 10%.

REPRESENTATION:
Justin Sherry, Applicant

INTERESTED PERSONS:

There were none.

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021
Development Services – Transportation Planning: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021
Development Services – Engineering Approvals: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Building Services: Comments dated June 16, 2021
Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 10, 2021
Operations Department – Technical & Stormwater – Comments dated June 15, 2021
Heritage Planner: Comments dated June 11, 2021
Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 9, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Justin Sherry, the applicant, provided an overview of the application requesting to construct a detached accessory dwelling unit exceeding the maximum allowed lot coverage.

The Committee acknowledged that if the proposed accessory dwelling unit did not exceed 10% lot coverage, the applicant could proceed directly to building permit. Mr. Sherry indicated the increased floor area is to accommodate a larger bedroom.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public.

Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street, asked if the City would require a tree inventory. Carlissa McLaren, Supervisor of Planning confirmed the owner is required to provide a tree inventory plan if the application was approved.

The Committee made a motion to deny the application.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be denied.

**Motioned by: Jay Dolan, Member
Second: Marc Pumple, Member
CARRIED**

- 5. (b) MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION:** A32/21 – 82 Peel Street
APPLICANT: Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., c/o Mark Condello on behalf of Sovereign Mapleview & Huronia Limited, c/o Tejdeep Chattha

This application, if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit an increased building density, to exceed the maximum lot coverage and front yard parking coverage allowed, a reduction in parking spaces, to recognize a deficient lot frontage and permission for tandem parking for a proposed six unit stacked townhouse development.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. To permit a maximum density of 73 units per net hectare, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.2.5.1(c), requires a maximum density of 53 units per net hectare.

2. To recognize an existing lot frontage of 20.25 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1, Table 5.3, requires a minimum lot frontage of 21 metres.
3. To permit a maximum lot coverage of 35.24%, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1, Table 5.3, requires a maximum lot coverage of 35%.
4. To permit a reduced parking ratio of 1 space per dwelling unit, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 4.6.1, Table 4.6, requires a minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.
5. To permit tandem parking in a residential building containing more than 3 dwelling units, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 4.6.1, Table 4.6, tandem parking is not permitted.
6. To permit a front yard parking coverage for a stacked townhouse of 57.8%, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.3.6.1, permits a maximum front yard coverage of 50%.

REPRESENTATION:

Mark Condello, Agent

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Brenda Kalweit-Padley
Christina Jack
Heather Waters
Farah Sunderji
Catherine Colebatch
Andrew Thomson
Thomas Kalweit
Mackenzie Hewitt

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021
Development Services – Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021
Development Services – Engineering Approvals: No comments
Building Services: Comments dated June 18, 2021
Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 15, 2021
Heritage Planner: Comments dated June 11, 2021
Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 9, 2021
Public Comments: Christina Jace, dated June 17, 2021
Public Comments: Farah Sunderji, dated June 17, 2021
Public Comments: Brenda Kalweit Padley, dated June 21, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Mark Condello, the agent, provided an overview of the application. Mr. Condello provided a presentation discussing topics on location, requested variances, elevations, conceptual site plan, and surrounding land uses.

He advised that the variances would facilitate the development of a six unit stacked townhouse rental development. The owner would like to keep the existing parcel as one lot for the purposes of rental and explained that rental projects with 5 or more units are eligible for CMCH funding. He noted the property is zoned RM2 which permits street townhouses as well as stacked townhouses, and variances for density and parking would not be required if the owner subdivided the parcel into three separate conveyable townhouse lots with second suites.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public.

Brenda Kalweit-Padley, 78 Peel Street, advised she and her husband Thomas own the neighbouring rental properties at 78 and 74 Peel Street. She expressed concern with the front yard turning into a parking lot, reduced parking spaces, tandem parking, increased density, noise, pollution, increased on-street parking, negative impacts to the character of the neighbourhood and decrease in property values.

Christina Jack, 103 Peel Street, expressed concern with the proposed reduction in parking spaces and increase in on-street parking. She discussed the parking issues with similar developments on the street and expressed concern with safety and the obstruction of snowplows and emergency vehicles. Ms. Jack expressed concern with increased density and stated that she feels future development should comply with the provisions of the Zoning By-law. She also expressed concern with tandem parking and noted the tenants will have to coordinate and share a parking area and a backyard. She said she would prefer three units.

Heather Waters, 121 Peel Street, said she supports development of the lot but does not support most of the front yard being paved. She expressed concern with increased parking on the street and would prefer fewer units.

Farah Sunderji, 107 Peel Street, expressed concern with increased on-street parking, increased density and the fully paved front yard. She also expressed concern with tandem parking and clarified with the applicant that tenants will have to co-ordinate the movement of vehicles.

Catherine Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street, asked for clarification on the total number of units proposed. The Chair confirmed six units are proposed. Ms. Colebatch asked why the parking could not be in the rear of the property. Mr. Condello explained that there is no access to the rear yard. Ms. Colebatch asked where the greenspace will be. Mr. Condello provided an illustration of the site plan and pointed out the greenspace in the rear yard and noted the rear yard exceeds the maximum required by the by-law.

Ms. Kalweit-Padley said there is no guarantee the garages will not be used for storage and suggested there could be access to the back with the reduction of units.

Thomas Kalweit, 74 and 78 Peel Street, expressed concern with the driveways, water runoff and parking.

Andrew Thomson, 104 Shirley Avenue, asked about the gross floor area of the units and asked if the units will be designed by an architect. Mr. Condello confirmed the units have been designed by an architect.

Tej Chattha, the owner, explained that if the lots were subdivided the proposed built form would be permitted without the need for variances and he could have gone straight to building permit, but he would prefer not to split the properties up and to manage, operate and maintain six rental units, allowing for CMHC financing.

Carlissa McLaren, Supervisor of Planning, noted the application is considered a technical variance and if subdivided through part lot control, the application would only be before the Committee for deficient lot frontage. The built form could proceed exactly as is. With respect to parkland dedication, the applicant is required to pay cash-in-lieu of parkland if parkland is not provided. She advised the property is subject to site plan control and if approved, the applicant would be required to go through a site plan approval process whereby all technical details (parking, landscaping, etc.) will be reviewed by technical staff at that time and noted if the property was subdivided, the density provision would not apply.

The Chair asked what type of materials are planned in the construction and noted it appears to be siding in the drawings submitted. Mr. Chattha said the front elevation is a mix of brick and siding. The other three sides are siding but he is willing to work with staff. The Chair asked why only one parking spot in the driveway as opposed to moving the dwelling back a little more to provide two parking spaces within the driveway and freeing up the garage for the tenants for storage. Mr. Condello said the building setback from the street is in keeping with the urban design principles and he is concerned staff will not want the building setback further from the street but is willing to work with staff. Ms. McLaren noted that the additional parking spot for each unit would trigger an additional variance. She explained that a parking area which provides for more than four

parking spaces adjoining a residentially zoned lot requires a 3-metre landscaped buffer area along either side of the property, which could not be provided on the lot.

The Committee made a motion to defer the application to allow the applicant time to review the building setback with City staff and increased driveway length to accommodate more parking spaces within the driveway.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be deferred.

**Motioned by: Jay Dolan, Member
Second: Marc Pumple, Member
CARRIED**

- 5. (c) CONSENT APPLICATION:** A33/21 – 98 Peel Street
APPLICANT: Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., c/o Mark Condello on behalf of Sovereign Mapleview & Huronia Limited, c/o Tejdeep Chattha

This application, if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit an increased building density, to exceed the maximum front yard parking coverage allowed, a reduction in parking spaces, and permission for tandem parking for a proposed six unit stacked townhouse development.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. To permit a maximum density of 60 units per net hectare, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.2.5.1(c), requires a maximum density of 53 units per net hectare.
2. To permit a reduced parking ratio of 1 space per dwelling, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 4.6.1, Table 4.6, requires a minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.
3. To permit tandem parking in a residential building containing more than 3 dwelling units, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 4.6.1, Table 4.6, tandem parking is not permitted.
4. To permit a front yard parking coverage for a stacked townhouse of 55.2%, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.3.6.1, permits a maximum front yard coverage of 50%.

REPRESENTATION:

Mark Condello, Agent

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Brenda Kalweit-Padley
Christina Jack
Heather Waters
Farah Sunderji
Catherine Colebatch
Andrew Thomson
Thomas Kalweit
Mackenzie Hewitt

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021
Development Services – Transportation Planning: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021
Development Services – Engineering Approvals: No comments
Building Services: Comments dated June 18, 2021
Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 15, 2021

Heritage Planner: Comments dated June 11, 2021
Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 9, 2021
Public Comments: Christina Jack, dated June 17, 2021
Public Comments: Farah Sunderji, dated June 17, 2021
Public Comments: Joseph Provenzano, dated June 17, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Mark Condello, the agent, provided an overview of the application and noted the application is a similar built form to what is being proposed at 82 Peel Street, although 92 Peel Street has a larger lot and less variances are required. He suggested the application be deferred to give time for further review and discussion with City staff.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public.

Catherine Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street, said the property next door (102 Peel Street) is an original farmhouse and asked if there would be a condition to ensure the applicant would mitigate any damage to this property during construction at 98 Peel Street.

Carlissa McLaren, Supervisor of Planning, advised she would confirm with the Building Department if this would be investigated during the building permit process.

The Committee made a motion to defer the application to allow the applicant time to review the building setback with City staff and increased driveway length to accommodate more parking spaces within the driveway.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be deferred.

**Motioned by: Marc Pumple, Member
Second: Jay Dolan, Member
CARRIED**

**5. (d) CONSENT APPLICATION: A36/21 – 26 Ashdale Court
APPLICANT: Dave Calvert**

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. A rear yard setback of 1 metre, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law, under Section 5.3.1, Table 5.3, requires a minimum rear yard setback of 7.0 metres.

REPRESENTATION:

Dave Calvert, Applicant

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Michael Bagley
Theresa Bagley
Scott Calvert
Cathy Colebatch
Mackenzie Hewitt
Andrew Thomson

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021
Development Services –Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021
Development Services – Engineering Approvals: Comments dated June 11, 2021
Building Services: Comments dated June 16, 2021
Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 10, 2021
Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 9, 2021
Public Comments: Michael & Theresa Bagley

DISCUSSION:

Dave Calvert, the applicant, provided an overview of the application requesting to permit a reduction in the rear yard setback to a dwelling to facilitate the construction of a two-car garage on the side of his house. He advised that the property is located on a corner lot at the north corner of Springdale Drive and Ashdale Court and due to the configuration of the lot, the side yard by zoning by-law standards is considered the rear yard.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public.

Michael Bagley, 25 Ashdale Court, expressed concern with the future garage addition location/positioning as it relates to closeness to his front door, the preservation of mature trees and drainage. The Chair asked where the trees are located. Mr. Bagley said they are near the boundary line between properties. The Chair noted that Parks Planning would require the applicant to submit a Tree Inventory, Canopy Survey, Assessment and Preservation Plan, with focus on boundary trees and trees impacted on private property.

Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street, asked how a 6-metre difference would be considered minor. The Chair explained that in the case of a corner lot the front lot line is deemed to be the shorter lot line that abuts a street. In this case, the front yard would be Springdale Drive regardless of the orientation of the dwelling towards Ashdale Court. The rear yard more appropriately reflects that of a side yard condition and Planning staff are of the opinion that the requested variance is technical in nature.

The Chair asked Planning staff to address Mr. Bagley’s concern about tree preservation. Madeline Kowalchuk, Planner, reviewed the comments received from Parks Planning and confirmed the applicant, as a condition of approval, must submit a Tree Inventory, Canopy Survey, Assessment and Preservation Plan with a focus on boundary trees before a building permit would be issued. She noted the tree preservation would be public information and can be viewed by the public. The Chair addressed Mr. Bagley’s concern regarding drainage and stormwater run-off and said Building Services will review lot grading during the building permit process should the application be approved.

The Committee made a motion to grant the application with conditions as outlined by staff.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be granted with conditions.

**Motioned by: Marc Pumple, Member
Second: Jay Dolan, Member
CARRIED**

5. (e) **CONSENT APPLICATION:** B10/21 – 23 Caroline Street
MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION: A31/21 – 23 Caroline Street
MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION: A37/21 – 23 Caroline Street
APPLICANT: Hymask Roofing, c/o Mark Hyatt on behalf of Roger and Paula Hanlon

The application (B10/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit the creation of a new residential lot.

The severed lands propose to have a lot area of 507.3 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 10.66 metres on **Caroline Street**.

The retained lands propose to have a lot area of 426.6 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 9.14 metres on **Caroline Street**.

This application (A31/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit a deficient lot area, lot frontage and side yard setback to facilitate the construction of a proposed single detached dwelling.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. A lot area of 426.60 square metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1 Table 5.3 requires a minimum lot area of 600 square metres.
2. A lot frontage of 9.14 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1 Table 5.3 requires a minimum lot frontage of 18 metres.
3. A side yard setback of 1.2 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.3.3.2(b), requires a minimum side yard setback of 3 metres.

This application (A37/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit a deficient lot area, lot frontage and side yard setback to facilitate the construction of a proposed single detached dwelling.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

1. A lot area of 507.30 square metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1 Table 5.3 requires a minimum lot area of 600 square metres.
2. A lot frontage of 10.66 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1 Table 5.3 requires a minimum lot frontage of 18 metres.
3. A side yard setback of 2.4 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under subsection 5.3.3.2(b), requires a minimum side yard setback of 3 metres.

REPRESENTATION:

Mark Hyatt, Applicant

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Catherine Colebatch

Mackenzie Hewitt

Andrew Thomson

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021

Development Services – Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021

Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021

Development Services – Engineering Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021

Building Services: Comments dated June 16, 2021

Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 15, 2021

Heritage Planner: Comments dated June 11, 2021

Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 10, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Mark Hyatt, the applicant, provided an overview of the applications. He noted the lot size and frontage is in keeping with the surrounding properties within the neighbourhood.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public.

Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street, asked where the parking area will be located on the property. Mr. Hyatt said the parking area will be in the front yard within the proposed driveway and the parking spots exceed the minimum size requirements. Ms. Colebatch asked for details about the amenity space. Mr. Hyatt explained that the front yard parking coverage is limited to a maximum of 50% and the portion of the front yard remaining will be amenity/greenspace. He advised a single detached dwelling unit with a second suite is proposed to be constructed on the severed lot and noted the dwelling on the severed lot will mirror the existing dwelling on the retained lot.

The Committee made a motion to grant the applications with conditions as outlined by staff.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the applications be granted with conditions.

**Motioned by: Jay Dolan, Member
Second: Marc Pumple, Member
CARRIED**

5. (f) **CONSENT APPLICATION:** B14/21 – 18 Prince Edward Place
CONSENT APPLICATION: B15/21 – 17 Prince Edward Place
CONSENT APPLICATION: B21/21 – 17 Prince Edward Place
APPLICANT: KLM Planning Partners c/o Keith MacKinnon on behalf of Mortgagebrokers.com Financial Group of Companies Inc.

The application (B14/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit the creation of a new portion of land to be merged with abutting property known municipally as 18 Prince Edward Place.

The severed lands (Part 12) propose to have a lot area of approximately 124.9 square metres and merge with abutting lands known as Part 3, Block 193.

The retained lands (Part 1(Block 192), Part 2, Part 10 and Part 11) propose to have a lot area of 834.6 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 15 metres on Prince Edward Place.

The application (B15/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit the creation of a new residential lot.

The severed lands (Part 7) propose to have a lot area of 902.9 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 16.85 metres on Prince Edward Place.

The retained lands (Part 4 (Block 194), Part 5 & Part 6) propose to have a lot area of 1,878.2 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 33.76 metres on Prince Edward Place.

The application (B21/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit the creation of a new residential lot.

The severed lands (Part 6) propose to have a lot area of 815.3 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 16.85 metres on Prince Edward Place.

The retained lands (Part 4 (Block 194) & Part 5) propose to have a lot area of 1062.8 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 16.91 metres on Prince Edward Place.

REPRESENTATION:

Keith MacKinnon, Agent

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mackenzie Hewitt

Andrew Thomson

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021

Development Services – Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021

Development Services – Parks Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021

Development Services – Engineering Approvals: Comments dated June 17, 2021

Building Services: Comments dated June 16, 2021

Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 15, 2021

LSRCA: Comments dated June 17, 2021

Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 10, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Keith MacKinnon, the agent, provided an overview of the applications. He provided an illustration of the draft reference plan and advised the first application is for a 125 square metre lot addition that would be merged with Part 3 to facilitate the creation of two lots on the north side of Prince Edward Place. The second and third applications are for the south side of Prince Edward Place and is for the creation of three residential lots. The applications for consent to severe land would result in the creation of five (5) vacant residential parcels that will meet the requirements of the R2 zone. Mr. MacKinnon discussed the condition set out by staff to consolidate Block 192 on Plan 51M-777 on the north side of Prince Edward Place with the retained lot and Block 194 on Plan 51M-777 on the south side of Prince Edward Place with the retained lot and noted there will no longer be remnant part lots. They will become lots that are in compliance with the Zoning By-law and will meet the objective of the plan of subdivision.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public. There were no comments from the public.

The Committee made a motion to grant the application with conditions as outlined by staff.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be granted with conditions.

Motioned by: Marc Pumple, Member

Second: Jay Dolan, Member

CARRIED

5. (g) CONSENT APPLICATION: B22/21 – 142 Sanford Street

APPLICANT: Innovative Planning Solutions, c/o Karla Tamayo on behalf of 5019129 Ontario Inc., c/o Lou Kelly

The application, if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit the creation of an easement for access purposes.

The proposed easement (shown on the attached sketch) will have an area of 179.76 square metres and a lot frontage of 4 metres on Sanford Street.

REPRESENTATION:

Karla Tamayo, Agent

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Greg Dumoulin
Mackenzie Hewitt
Andrew Thomson

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021
Development Services – Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021
Development Services – Parks Approvals: No comments
Development Services – Engineering Approvals: No comments
Building Services: No comments
Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 10, 2021
Heritage Planner: Comments dated June 11, 2021
Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 10, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Karla Tamayo, the agent, provided an overview of the application requesting an easement over the subject lands in favour of 144 Sanford Street. She provided a presentation to the Committee members discussing topics including the subject site, proposed access easement and parking plan. She explained the need for an access easement is because 144 Sanford Street has no driveway access. She noted no parking will be permitted within the easement and advised they will be submitting a minor variance application to request permission for the deficient drive aisle width.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public. There were no comments from the public.

The Committee made a motion to grant the application with conditions as outlined by staff.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the application be granted with conditions.

Motioned by: Jay Dolan, Member
Second: Marc Pumple, Member
CARRIED

5. (h) **CONSENT APPLICATION:** B23/21 – 10, 12 & 14 Heath Street
CONSENT APPLICATION: B24/21 – 10, 12 & 14 Heath Street
MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION: A34/21 – 14 Heath Street
APPLICANT: The County of Simcoe, c/o Julie Nolan

The application (B23/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to re-establish a boundary lot line.

The severed lands propose to have a lot area of 846 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 21.34 metres on Heath Street.

The retained lands propose to have a lot area of 673 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 17.07 metres on Heath Street.

The application (B24/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to re-establish a boundary lot line.

The severed lands propose to have a lot area of 423 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 10.67 metres on Heath Street.

The retained lands propose to have a lot area of 423 square metres and a proposed lot frontage of 10.67 metres on Heath Street.

This application (A34/21), if granted by the Committee of Adjustment, will serve to permit a deficient lot frontage.

The applicant is seeking the following minor variance(s):

- 1. A lot frontage of 17.07 metres, whereas the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, under Section 5.3.1 Table 5.3, requires a minimum lot frontage of 18 metres.**

REPRESENTATION:

Julie Nolan, Applicant

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mackenzie Hewitt

Andrew Thomson

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Development Services - Planning: Comments dated June 23, 2021

Development Services – Traffic: Comments dated June 14, 2021

Development Services – Parks Approvals: No comments

Development Services – Engineering Approvals: Comments dated June 14, 2021

Building Services: No comments

Finance Department: DCA comments dated June 10, 2021

Alectra Utilities: Comments dated June 10, 2021

DISCUSSION:

Julie Nolan, the applicant, provided an overview of the applications. She referred to the Planning Justification Report submitted by the County of Simcoe advising that the subject lands are part of a historical plan of subdivision and were previously owned by the Ontario Housing Corporation, prior to being inherited by the Simcoe County Housing Corporation. The subject lands were created by plan of subdivision (Lots 20 and 21 on Plan 1502) and operate as if they are three individual properties today, however part-lot-control exemption was never applied to legally convey each half of the semi-detached dwelling separately, or to adjust the lot line between the single detached dwelling and the semi-detached dwelling so that they could be conveyed as separate lots.

The Secretary-Treasurer read a summary of all comments received to date.

The Committee opened discussion to the public. There were no comments from the public.

The Committee made a motion to grant the applications with conditions as outlined by staff.

DECISION:

The decision of the Committee is that the applications be granted with conditions.

Motioned by: Marc Pumple, Member
Second: Jay Dolan, Member
CARRIED

6. OTHER BUSINESS

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

July 28, 2021, at 5:00 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

9. The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.



Steve Trotter, Chair



Janice Sadgrove, Secretary-Treasurer