

The Committee of Adjustment and Consent for the Corporation of the Town of Milton met in regular session at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers with Mark Kluge in the Chair.

I. AGENDA ANNOUNCEMENTS/AMENDMENTS

The Secretary Treasurer noted two amendments to public notices issued for tonight's meeting.

- File: A2-19/044/M - 245 Martin Street. The public notice stated the applicant was proposing a new single family dwelling when it should have read an "addition".
- File: A1/19/048/M - 55 Ontario Street South. The public notice stated a 1.5 metre setback when it should have read 2.0 metres.

II. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

III. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL OR WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATIONS

- Application File A2-19/047/M - 372 Pine Street was deferred at the request of the applicant prior to the Hearing to revise the site plan and will proceed to a Hearing for February.

IV. MINUTES

COA-001-20 THAT Minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Meeting held on December 12, 2019 be approved.

V. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Minor Variance Applications:

1. File: D13 (A2-19/042/M) - 449 Baylis Court

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow an increase in gross floor area for an accessory structure.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The applicant is requesting to construct an open gazebo in the rear yard with an increased gross floor area.
- The proposed gazebo meets all other requirements of the zoning by-law.
- Requesting a gross floor area of 19.35 square metres from the permitted 10 square metres to better suited the rear yard renovation.
- Owner's lot is large compared to the neighbours.
- The requested increase in gross floor area will not be overbearing.

Public Input:

Sue Coelho noted the following:

- Her backyard faces the front yard of the subject property and can see into the backyard.
- Area residents do not have the same size yards and impacts the enjoyment of their own space and devalues property.
- She feels the gazebo is too large and compares it to the size of a garage.
- The structure's height is too high and will tower over the fence line.
- She feels property values will decrease and considers it an eyesore.
- Just because they have a larger lot doesn't mean they should build a larger gazebo.
- When neighbours open their patio doors they will see a large roof line and impacts the enjoyment of their own spaces and devalues their properties.
- What's to stop them enclosing the gazebo at a later date?
- Excessive noise during the construction.

Carl Chan noted the following:

- Excessive noise during construction

Committee Deliberations:

Member Chandler asked the following

- Did any neighbours at the rear provide comments?

Member Summers asked the following

- Rendering shows the roofline of the gazebo does it extend to the fence line?
- Will the proposed structure be constructed of cedar to match the fence?

Member Klug asked the following

- If the applicant didn't need a variance for the increased floor area, would the height meet the requirements of the Zoning By-law?
- The rendering provided to the Committee shows the gazebo closed on two sides. If the applicant wanted to enclose the whole gazebo would they have to come back to the Committee?

Staff noted the following with respect to the Committee's questions:

- The Secretary-Treasurer did not receive any written or oral comments from the neighbours at the rear of the property
- The height of the structure would meet the zoning by-law. The height is measured to mid-point.

The Applicant noted:

- The structure will be constructed of wood but not likely cedar.

- The roofline is within the required setbacks of the Zoning By-law

COA-002-20 THAT Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/042/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* to the Milton Committee of Adjustment and Consent requesting permission to allow an increase in total gross floor area to 19.35 square metres WHEREAS Section 4.2.1, Table 4A of Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, requires that accessory buildings and structures are permitted a total gross floor area of 10 square metres on Lot 51, R.P. 20M-1022, municipally identified as 449 Baylis Court in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That a building permit be applied for prior to construction.
2. That the attached gazebo drawing form part of this Decision as Schedule A.
3. That the proposal be subject of an expiry of two (2) years from the date of decision, if the conditions are not met, the proposed development does not proceed and/or a building permit is not secured.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

Planning staff have reviewed the requested variance and offer no objection to its approval as the proposal makes efficient use of the land, will not result in overbuilding of the property, will not alter the view, sightlines or personal enjoyment of the subject property or any neighbouring properties, and will not be of a detrimental impact to the subject lands or the surrounding area.

2. File: D13 (A2-19/043/M) - 11260 Inglis Drive

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended, to allow an increase in fence height for a proposed security fence in the front yard.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The homeowner is requesting to construct a security fence around the front yard of the property that exceeds the maximum height permitted in the Zoning By-law. The fence consists of a wrought iron fence, a stone wall and a metal gate.
- The fence is for security - not visual. The gates are using steel pickets.

- The applicant noted additional landscaping and vegetation. For screen purposes as other areas on the property are septic beds and tanks.
- The applicant showed pictures of neighbouring properties of examples where fencing could be placed without any zoning issues.
- Fence pickets are within an easement. Applicant required clarification with respect to impacts.

Public Input:

Lorain Bruno noted the following:

- The height of the fence is double than what is permitted.
- No appropriate for this area.
- Walls are not required, low vegetation is all that is required.
- The fence will not stop theft.
- Why are there spikes on top of the fence posts? What if a child or coyote gets caught on the fence? The homeowner is responsible for any injuries of his property.
- I don't believe the fence is his last variance and will come back and beg for more conveniences.
- Rural areas do not have high fences.

Scott Johnson noted the following:

- If you look at pictures the applicant provided, the properties are all on 1.5 acre lots with very few fences. Fences are used to enclose pools in their neighbourhood.
- This proposed fence at least a 6 foot plus height fence.
- None of these driveways have functioning gates on them.
- Think it is an eyesore.
- The idea of putting a 6' fence and then talking about security then putting trees along the property line, you would be better to leave it open
- The homeowner has a five or six car garage along with a carport. If he's worried about security, store their valuables in the garage.

Frank Bruno noted the following:

- Fencing does not deter break-ins.

Committee Deliberations:

Member Chandler asked the following

- The proposed variance would apply to the gate height?
- Are fences allowed in the front yard?
- What is permitted on this easement? Did receive hydro easements along the front of the property?
- Asked staff about the gate element. There is an existing stone works erected on both sides of the driveway.

Member Summers asked the following

- Variance already submitted for a carport. This is the third variance on this property.
- Not sure why a fence would be required when homeowners have security alarms, car ports and concealed areas of the property.

Member Kluge asked the following

- Can you fence the entire property?
- Asked Jeff Jansen, a lot of the work has been done?

Staff responded as follows:

- Natalie Stopar, Town Planner, noted that the proposed gate height and the fence is 2.13 metres because of the gate. The pickets are at 1.8 metres.
- Fences are permitted in a front yard with a maximum height of 1 metre.
- Typically hydro would be located within the Right of Way however for this neighbourhood, the hydro was located within an easement along the front of the property. Milton Hydro provided comments that the fence cannot be located within the easement. Posts would have to be relocated. Contractors are required to contact One Call for locates.
- Regarding the gate element, there is an existing stone works erected on both sides of the driveway. That stone work exceeds the by-law, if the variance is not approved it will have to be reconstructed to comply with the maximum height to comply with the by-law.
- Staff confirmed that fencing an entire property is permitted although at different height requirements. The by-law also does not speak to specifications of the type of fence or spikes nor does the Building Code.

The Applicant noted as follows:

- Mr. Jansen noted that his client hired a landscaper to construct the fencing. He was informed by my client at the time all work stopped and we started to minor variance process. .

COA-003-20 **THAT** Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/041/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow an increase the maximum fence height to 2.13 metres WHEREAS Section 4.5.2 iii) of Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended, requires that within a front yard, the maximum fence height shall be no more than 1.0 metres on Lot 6, R.P. M-797, municipally identified as 11260 Inglis Drive in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE DENIED.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and feel that the requested variances met the intent of both the Official Plan and

Zoning By-law but are not minor in nature and are not appropriate for the development and use of the land.

CONSIDERATION FROM THE PLANNING REPORT:

The existing neighbourhood consists of large single detached homes on large residential lots. The majority of the lots do not include any fencing. Some lots have black metal picket fencing within the rear yard and a few lots have decorative fencing and pillars directly adjacent to the driveway entrance. Most residents have planted trees and other vegetation to create visual barriers between the lots and the street or adjacent properties.

The Zoning By-law defines a front yard as the yard extending across the full width of the lot between the front lot line and the nearest wall of the principal building on the lot. Based on this definition, approximately 120 metres of fencing is proposed within the front yard that will exceed the maximum permitted height of the Zoning By-law. Although a majority of the fencing is proposed to be black metal picket fence, the increased height of the fence along the entirety of the front yard will increase the visual impact of the fence on the neighbourhood. The proposed fencing will have a significant visual impact on the neighbourhood and will not be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.

3. File: D13 (A2-19/044/M) - 245 Martin Street

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow an increase in lot coverage and setbacks for a proposed addition to the existing dwelling.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The homeowner is requesting to construct an addition to their home
- Reduced rear yard setback and an addition to the existing garage is only fit on this side yard. The lot is triangular. Hard to get a square house on a triangle yard. The lot coverage is because it is a bungalow.

Public Input:

Colin Ireland noted the following:

- Concern with the side yard being less than two feet from the property line.
- The property is quite large and don't understand why they are going to close the property line.
- We cannot build our own addition.
- There is a retaining wall between the two properties and could be compromised.
- There is an old tree on the property that could be compromised as well.

- Drainage could be an issue. Water already pools into my property on my driveway.

Committee Deliberations:

Member Kluge asked the following

- Does the fence have to be removed?

Staff noted:

- Natalie Stopar, Town Planner, indicated on the site plan that the addition was on the opposite side of the property from Mr. Ireland's property and would not affect him.
- The survey indicates that apportion of the fence and driveway have to be removed from the Town right-of-way. This is a requirement of the Engineering Department as part of their approval of this minor variance.

COA-004-20 **THAT** Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/044/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow:

1. A decrease in the minimum exterior side yard setback to 0.68 metres WHEREAS Section 6.2, Table 6B of Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, requires that that the minimum exterior side yard setback be 4.0 metres; and
2. An increase in the maximum lot coverage to 29.5% WHEREAS Section 6.2 Table 6B(1) states that the maximum lot coverage for lots having a lot area between 60 square metres and 830 square metres be 25%

on Part lot 15, Concession 2, NS (Trafalgar) municipally identified as 245 Martin Street in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That a building permit be applied for prior to construction.
2. That the attached gazebo drawing form part of this Decision as Schedule A.
3. That the proposal be subject of an expiry of two (2) years from the date of decision, if the conditions are not met, the proposed development does not proceed and/or a building permit is not secured.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

The proposed 0.68 metre setback, although narrow, is still sufficient to permit the Owners to access the rear yard without encroaching onto the Town right-of-way. The

Owner could also access the rear yard through a rear door proposed in the garage addition, and through the proposed 2.08 metre interior side yard.

The proposal includes an addition with a covered porch in the front yard, an addition for a bedroom in the rear yard, and a garage and mudroom addition in the exterior side yard. The garage and mudroom addition is the largest addition and comprises approximately 6.4% of the lot area. The existing dwelling and all proposed additions are proposed to be 1 storey in height, which will further reduce the impact of the increase in lot coverage on the neighbourhood and streetscape. Lastly, the proposal still accommodates a sufficiently sized rear yard with outdoor amenity space.

4. File: D13 (A2-19/045/M) - 236 Sydney Street

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow an increase in lot coverage for a proposed new dwelling.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The homeowner is requesting to construct a new single family dwelling
- Increased lot coverage for 26.5%
- Chose this area and our design is to fit into the neighbourhood. Our design was reviewed by the design team and they had no issues.
- Have engaged both homeowners on either side

Public Input:

None

Committee Deliberations:

Member Summers asked the following

- Why were the Existing trees on site removed?

Member Kluge asked the following

- Covered porches, but that contributes the increased floor space. Yes correct both the covered porch and detached garage are included in the lot coverage.

Staff noted:

- The Planner noted that the covered porch and detached garage are included in the lot coverage.

The Applicant noted:

- An arborist was retained and confirmed the trees were damaged.

COA-005-20 THAT Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/045/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow an increase in the maximum lot coverage to 26.5% WHEREAS Section 6.2 Table 6B(1) states that the maximum lot coverage for lots having a lot area between 60 square metres and 830 square metres be 25% on Lots 75 and 76, Plan 95 municipally identified as 245 Martin Street in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That a building permit be applied for within two (2) years from the date of this Decision.
2. That the attached site plan form part of this decision as Schedule A and that the single detached dwelling and detached garage be substantially in accordance with the Schedule A.

Note:

1. *Development Charges will be applied in accordance with Town, Region and School Board by-laws. All development charge inquiries should be forwarded to Development Finance at 905-878-7252 ext. 2402.*

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

Staff note the proposal positively responds to the design guidance provided by the Council-endorsed CBD Urban Design Guidelines, regarding roof and massing treatment, building size and height, porch and garage design, etc. The large porch is a positive contribution as it retains elements of traditional houses. The location of the garage at the rear of the property preserves the predominant pattern of garages found in the neighbourhood. The proposed 9.07 metres (29' 09") building height to the top of the roof ensures compatibility with nearby properties, in particular the listed property at 246 Sydney Street. The proposed 3.04 metres and 4.87 metres side yard setbacks contribute significantly to retain the separation between buildings commonly seen in the area.

5. File: D13 (A2-19/046/M) - 2261 Kean Hill Drive

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow an additional garage on the lot.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The homeowner is requesting to construct an additional garage in the rear yard
- Also asking that the height be 6.7 metres also requesting a maximum width for turn around and remain gravel.
- 2.6 acre rural lot, ground keeping equipment. Need for additional storage. Stand up second floor for more storage. The driveway is off a gravel road and more of an expense savings.

Public Input:

None

Committee Deliberations:

Member Kluge asked the following

- The driveway access is off of Second Line? Is there an issue with two entrances?

Staff noted:

- Staff noted that our Engineering Team, evaluated and no issues were raised. An entrance permit has to be applied for. No issues with respect to fire for an secondary entrance

COA-006-20 THAT Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/042/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow:

1. Two (2) garages on a property WHEREAS Section 4.1.1.2 i) of Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended states that only one (1) garage and/or carport is permitted on a lot;
2. An increase in building height to 6.7 metres WHEREAS Section 4.1.1.2.2 viii) of Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended, states that the maximum height of a detached garage and/or carport is 4.3 metres;
3. An increase in the maximum driveway width to 10 metres WHEREAS Section 5.5.2 e) E) of Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended, states that a residential driveway be the maximum width of 8.0 metres with lots having a greater frontage than 11 metres; and
4. A gravel parking area WHEREAS Section 5.1 ii) of Zoning By-law 144-2003, as amended states that all parking areas must be surface treated with asphalt, concrete, concrete pavers or similar material;

on Lot 16 Plan M-771 municipally identified as 2261 Kean Hill Drive in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That the development proceed as per the updated Site Plan submitted to the Town of Milton on January 20, 2020, which illustrates the location of the existing hydro pole, septic system and well.
2. That all required building permits be applied for and received prior to construction.
3. That an Entrance Permit application be made and approved for the proposed driveway, to the satisfaction of the Town's Engineering Department.
4. That the approval be subject of an expiry of two (2) years from the date of decision if the conditions are not met, if the proposed development does not proceed and/or Site Plan Approval is not secured.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

Staff noted that the intent of limiting the number of garages on a property is to ensure that the dwelling, remains the primary focal point. As the proposed accessory structure is located to the rear of the property and will be generally screened from the public realm by the existing landscaping, as well as remaining well under the lot coverage requirements of the by-law, staff have no concerns. With respect to the increased height requested, it is minor and will be of no detrimental impact to the subject lands. This increase in driveway width only applies to one section of the driveway to accommodate a vehicle turning area into the garage, outside of this area, the proposed driveway would comply with the provisions of the by-law. As the driveway is secondary to the main driveway accessing the residential dwelling on Kean Hill Drive and is located to the rear of the property, staff have no objections.

6. File: D13 (A1-19/048/M) - 55 Ontario Street South

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow a rear yard setback for an outdoor play area for an associated day care use.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The applicant is requesting reduced rear yard setback for a play area.
- The previous minor variance back in October for the daycare use. The rear yard setback was denied at the time of the application was bringing forward a daycare use in the housekeeping amendment. The housekeeping amendment has since been approved and in full force and effect.

- A scoped site plan application has been submitted for the daycare play area. Advanced so that we can proceed with the minor variance.

Public Input:

None

Committee Deliberations:

Member Chandler asked the following

- Is the by-law in effect?
- To clarify, the edge of the play area to the fencing is 2 metres. Is staff opposed to the setback to the play area? The required 12 metre setback applies to the commercial use. The play area is not the principal use. Why are we here?

Member Summers asked the following

- What is considered the rear yard?

Member Klug asked the following

- What are the safety issues being addressed?

Staff noted:

- The daycare use under the Housekeeping By-law update is now in full force and effect.
- The front yard is considered to be Ontario Street and Nipissing Road is the rear yard.
- Safety concerns will be provided through the site plan application. The site plan actually shows bollards and landscaping.
- The second opening paragraph in Section 7.2 states that “no person shall within any Commercial Zone use any lot or erect, alter, use any building or structure in accordance with the following:”. As stated, the provisions of the UGC-MU Zone are applicable. A Rear Yard means a yard extending across the full width of the lot between the rear lot line and the nearest wall of the principal building, structure or use on the lot. The play area is associated with the principal use of the lot and therefore the rear yard setback is to be applied to the proposed edge of the outdoor play area.

COA-007-20 **THAT** Minor Variance Application D13 (A1-19/048/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow a decrease in the minimum rear yard setback to 2.0 metres WHEREAS Section 7.2, Table 7C of Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended requires a minimum rear yard setback of 12.0 metres on Part Lot 13, Concession 3 NS (Trafalgar) municipally identified as 55 Ontario Street South in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That the outdoor play area be subject to site plan approval.
2. That all applicable building permits be applied for and received, prior to construction.
3. That the approval be subject of an expiry of two years from the date of decision if the conditions are not met, if the proposed development does not proceed and/or a building permit is not secured.

NOTES:

1. The applicant may be required to submit additional information through the associated Site Plan (SP-31/19) review process in regards to cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication obligations. Cash-in-lieu obligations will not apply provided the proposed day care addition remains under 50% of the originally constructed GFA, minus the areas of any subsequent (existing) additions.
2. Development charges are applicable and payable prior to Building Permit issuance, at the non-residential rate in effect at that time in accordance with Town, Region and School Boards by-laws. All development inquiries should be forwarded to Finance at ext. 2402.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

Staff noted prior to operating the day care centre, site plan approval for the outdoor play area, building and occupancy permits will be required. Through this process, all construction and occupancy details will be addressed The Ministry of Education who oversees child care licensing, will also ensure that buildings, equipment and playground standards are in compliance with the applicable legislation.

7. File: D13 (A2-19/049/M) - Unit 1 and 16, Block 257, R.P. 20M-1219

Requesting relief from Zoning By-law 016-2014, as amended, to allow a decrease in the minimum distance between a driveway and the point of intersection of two intersecting streets.

Notice of a Public Hearing was provided in accordance with the Planning Act requirements. No written comments were received prior to the Hearing.

Owner/Applicant Input:

The applicant provided a brief overview of the proposed application.

- The applicant noted due the angling of the condominium roadway the variances are required.
- The roadway is a private condominium and will only be used by residents.

- Previous models have come before the Committee with the same issue

Public Input:

None

Committee Deliberations:

Member Summers asked the following

- Does the zoning by-law differentiate between a local and private road?
- If the condominium is built, who is responsible for this error, since it happened before?

Member Klug asked the following

- Seen this variance before, the site specific by law

Staff noted:

- The By-law requirement does not differentiate between public and private roads. Section 5.6.2 iii) is applicable to both types of streets. Typically private streets are smaller in width and primarily serve residents within a condominium development.
- A variation of reductions have been supported in the past, and have been recognized through site specific zoning by-laws associated with specific developments.
- The condominium has not been built yet. The variances have been identified and assessed through the site plan review.

COA-007-20 **THAT** Minor Variance Application D13 (A2-19/049/M) under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* requesting permission to allow:

1. A decrease in the minimum distance for Unit 1 to 3.21 metres WHEREAS Section 5.6.2 iii) requires that the minimum distance between a driveway and the point of intersection of two intersecting streets be 6.0 metres; and
2. A decrease in the minimum distance for Unit 16 to 2.83 metres WHEREAS Section 5.6.2 iii) requires that the minimum distance between a driveway and the point of intersection of two intersecting streets be 6.0 metres;

on Units 1 and 16, Block 257, R.P. 20M-1219 in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton BE APPROVED with the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. That Building Permits be applied for prior to construction.
2. That clearance from the Boyne Phase 3 Trustees be provided to the satisfaction of the Town's Corporate Services Department.
3. That the approval be subject of an expiry of two (2) years from the date of decision if the conditions are not met, if the proposed development does not proceed and/or a building permit is not secured.

NOTES:

1. Regional development charges and education development charges are applicable in accordance with the appropriate agency's policies and by-laws. Town development charges and other charges are applicable on any future development in accordance with Town policies and by-laws and other applicable legislation. All development inquiries should be forwarded to Finance at 905-878-7252, ext. 2402.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee considered the associated Planning Report dated January 24, 2020 and offer no objection and that the requested variances are minor in nature, conforms to the general policies and intent of both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and is appropriate for the development and use of the land.

Consideration from the Planning Report

Staff noted that the intent of the required distance is to ensure that safe vehicular movements. On a rear lane private condominium road, meant to service just the condominium development, a reduction in distance may be more acceptable. No issues were identified with respect to sight line concerns, fire or waste management access concerns and vehicle maneuverability.

VI. NEXT MEETING

Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

"Original Signed by"

Chair

"Original Signed by"

Secretary-Treasurer