



The Corporation of the
Town of Milton
Committee of Adjustment Minutes

March 30, 2023, 6:00 p.m.

Members Present: Chair Kluge, Tyler Slaght, Christopher Trombino, Tharushe Jayaveer, Salman Ellahi, Rachel Suffern

Staff Present: Greta Susa, Mollie Kuchma, Serena Graci, Natalie Stopar

The Committee of Adjustment for the Corporation of the Town of Milton met in regular session. Electronically via Live Streaming Video.

1. **AGENDA ANNOUNCEMENTS / AMENDMENTS**

There were no agenda announcements/amendments.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

3. **REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL OR WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATIONS**

There were no requests for deferrals or withdrawals of applications.

4. **MINUTES**

4.1 **Minutes of Committe of Adjustment Hearing held on Thursday, February 23, 2023.**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

1. The MINUTES of Milton Committee of Adjustment and Consent Meeting held on Thursday, February 23, 2023 BE APPROVED.

Carried

5. **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

5.1 A23-022M - 678 Harrison Drive

Charlene Foley, owner, address: 678 Harrison Road, Milton, provided an overview of the application.

Questions to Owner Foley

Member Ellahi inquired about the Easement coming into the property, as he believed one column is coming into that easement. Owner Foley stated the drawings were revised, which displays it was moved the necessary 10 inches outside of the easement. Town Planner Suffern stated one of the conditions were that the cabana be located wholly outside of the easement. She claimed the revised site plan will be provided during the building permit stage, thus planning is confident that it will not impose on the easement.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A22 – 022/M) for 678 Harrison Road in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the cabana and hardscaping shall be located and constructed wholly outside of the Town easement.
2. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision.
3. That the approval be subject to 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.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A22 – 022/M) for 678 Harrison Road in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the cabana and hardscaping shall be located and constructed wholly outside of the Town easement.
2. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision.

3. That the approval be subject to 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.

Carried

5.2 A23-023M - 8819 Boston Church Road

Rob Russell, agent for the applicant, address: 209-162 Guelph Street, Georgetown, provided an overview of the application.

Questions to Agent Russell

Member Ellahi inquired about how the agent mentioned the building is as built, but the site plan mentions a proposed storage building. He also raised another point, that when the Committee Members went for their site visit no one opened the doors, and thus making it very challenging to make the decisions without seeing the property first.

Agent Russell sympathized it is difficult when there is gated access to the property. He stated Town Staff have been out to the property many times, as this wasn't just a zoning compliance issue, but there is also a building permit compliance issue that are ready to be resolved once the zoning issue is resolved. Agent Russell also claimed he is not sure why the drawings state proposed structure, as he is not the one who prepared the drawings. They were viewed by town staff several times, and it wasn't something that was asked to be changed.

Member Jayaveer inquired whether or not the bathroom and kitchenette were removed from the property. Agent Russell claimed as of right now it has not been removed, but if the variance is approved and the drawings are resubmitted to the building department, and the permit gets approved then those changes would be made. As of right now no changes are to be made, as the building permit first needs to be obtained.

Member Slaght inquired approximately when the significant natural feature were removed, specifically the woodland. Agent Russell claimed based on aerial photos approximately 15-16 years ago is when the natural features were removed. Agent Russell also added there was an issue with Conservation Halton, where there was an after the fact permit and agreement generated with Conservation Halton.

Questions to Planner Kuchma

Member Ellahi asked Planner Kuchma, if it is necessary to put a condition that this building cannot be used as a secondary unit. Planner Kuchma clarified that the following is already included as a condition; that it is not permitted to be habitable. Discussions have already been had with the agent that the stove initially shown was removed. However, there is nothing that would preclude the applicant from having a bathroom, small kitchenette area and plumbing in the structure. But, it cannot be habitable in the sense that it cannot be a secondary dwelling unit.

Member Jayaveer inquired about the illegal use that has ceased to exist on the site, and if planner Kuchma can provide insight on the compliance issues. Planner Kuchma claimed there has indeed have been several compliance issues, many that have been resolved to date. The outstanding concern is the building permit, as the structure was constructed without the necessary approvals. Conservation Halton approval was required, and there is now a compliance agreement and thus Conservation Halton is satisfied. There were also Zoning By-law violations in terms of contractors taking place on the property. By-law went out to the property and confirmed illegal use was no longer taking place on the property. The violation was thus closed from a land-use perspective. All that is outstanding on this property at this time is the building permit which first requires the variances to be approved to address the non-compliant variances.

Member Ellahi inquired about his lack of confidence on addressing condition #5, as the structure is already built. Planner Kuchma claimed her opinion on proceeding is, the application is either voted on based on how the conditions are written in the planning report, or that the building permit be obtained in 1 year time rather than 6 months time, as the agent expresses their concern of 6 months being too short of a timeframe, especially if an EIA is required. Planner Kuchma claimed that the building department is okay with extending the timeline. Planner Kuchma is professionally not comfortable with removing condition #5 without having comment from Halton Region that they are satisfied with removing this condition. Planner Kuchma recommends the Committee either votes on the application as is (with the conditions included in the planning report), or the Committee requests to defer the application so further conversation can take place with Halton Region. The reason being is because Halton Region has indicated this property is on designated Regional natural heritage system and Greenbelt natural heritage system.

Chair Kluge inquired about what id down the road this property becomes a residential unit when it shouldn't be. He asked if planner Kuchma is comfortable with the plans, she claimed that is she comfortable and confident, as the applicant is required to submit building drawings to be reviewed by Plans exam staff, a building permit would be required to be issued, the property would be inspected by Town Building Staff, and the applicant we be required to comply with all provisions of the zoning by-law. If there were ever concerns in the future about there being an illegal secondary dwelling unit then By-law enforcement can become involved at the point. Planner Kuchma reiterated Chair Kluge's point that things are changing from a policy perspective, such that one day there could be permissions to permit secondary dwelling units.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23-023/M) for 8819 Boston Church Road in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the detached accessory structure shall be permitted in accordance with the site plan and building elevations, prepared by OCBA Inc., date stamped by Town Zoning on February 27, 2023.
2. That a building permit application be obtained within one (1) year from the date of this decision.
3. That the approval be subject to 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.
4. That the structure is used for personal use and the storage of personal items only, is not habitable, and not used for occupation.
5. That an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) shall be submitted for review that provides a restoration and enhancement plan to restore the features, and their ecological and hydrological functions, which were removed as a result of the construction of the accessory building.

Carried

Will Verwey, agent for the applicant, address: 2106 Gordon Street, Guelph, provided and overview of the application.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23-015M) for 20 Stokes Trail in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the single detached dwelling and driveway be substantially constructed in accordance with the site plan prepared by Van Harten Surveying Inc. and stamped by Town of Milton Zoning staff on January 16, 2023;
2. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision;
3. That the approval be subject to 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;
4. That prior to the initiation of works, a Conservation Halton Permit be obtained from Conservation Halton for the proposed development; and
5. That details of the proposed private servicing, including a septic brief, shall be provided by the applicant to the satisfaction of Halton Region.

Carried

5.4 A23-017M - 1820 Reading Court

Lino Malito, owner, address: 6205 airport road, Mississauga provided an overview of the application

Questions to Owner Malito

Member Ellahi inquired about the compactor not being visible from James Snow Parkway, and being installed on reading Court. Owner Malito claimed the compactor is set back quite a bit from James Snow Parkway and will be screened by landscape, and it will be painted white to blend in with the building. Member Ellahi then inquired about whether there was a picture from Reading Court facing towards the compactor. Owner Malito

showed the Committee a picture of the location of the compactor if you were looking directly from Reading Court. Owner Malito claimed the compactor would be near truck parking, and thus when you are looking directly from Reading Court you will not see the base of the compactor. Member Ellahi then inquired if the shoots of the compactor would be visible, the owner claimed the the top of the compactor would be visible but eventually when the trees (landscape) surrounding the compactor do reach full maturity it will mitigate the top of the compactor. Owner Malito also claimed the By-law only requires a base-enclosure.

Questions to Planner Stopar

Chair Kluge inquired whether or not the compactor would be noisy as there are residential areas within James Snow Parkway. Planner Stopar claimed, industrial uses are required to comply to provincial noise guidelines for sensitive uses, such as residential uses. In addition, this site has gone through site plan approval and there has been a noise study provided. Although unsure of the noise these compactors produce, they are outside of the loading areas of this building. They do have to make minor changes to the site plan, thus if there is noise they can ask for that study to be provided.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23 -017/M) for 1820 Reading Court in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the waste compactors be located in accordance with the site plan, prepared by Orlando Corporation, date stamped by Town Zoning on February 15, 2023.
2. That a building permit application be obtained if required within two (2) years from the date of this decision.
3. That the approval be subject to 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.

Carried

5.5 A23-020M - 4252 Henderson Road

Shane Wilson, agent of the applicant, address: 121 Central Avenue, Grimsby, provided an overview of the application.

Agent Wilson claimed only one of his variances have been identified but he did apply for two. The second variance that was requested but mentioned was the 0.18 metres of additional height. Planner Suffern stated zoning did review the second variance and they measured it from average grade meaning they were in compliance thus a second variance wasn't needed.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23-020/M) for 4525 Henderson Road in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the proposed dwelling shall be generally located and constructed in accordance with the site plan and building elevations, prepared by Details Matter, date stamped by Town Zoning on February 28, 2023.
2. That a Building Permit be applied for and received prior to construction of the new single detached dwelling and a demolition permit be received for the existing detached dwelling prior to demolition.
3. That prior to Building Permit issuance for the new single-detached dwelling, the applicant must provide a Letter of Undertaking to the Town of Milton agreeing to:
 1. Provide a performance guarantee in the amount of \$10,000.00 to ensure the demolition of the existing single detached dwelling upon completion of the new dwelling.
 2. Obtain a Demolition Permit for the demolition of the existing dwelling prior to occupancy being granted for the new single detached dwelling.
 3. Complete all works associated with the demolition of the existing detached dwelling within 90 days of occupancy being granted for the new single detached dwelling.

4. That prior to Building Permit issuance for the new dwelling, a Grading Plan be provided to the satisfaction of Development Engineering, including the following:

Downspout locations; existing elevations along property line (which are not to be altered); existing and proposed elevations for the interior property; swale locations, directions and slopes; and, proposed elevations at building corners.

5. That the approval be subject to an expiry of two (2) years from the date of decision in which time occupancy for the new single detached dwelling must be received.

Carried

5.6 A23-018M - 56 Steeles Avenue East

Michael Scott, agent for the applicant, address: 18 Lynwood Avenue provided an overview of the application.

Questions to Agent Scott

Member Trombino inquired about with the addition of the second floor how many extra bodies does he anticipate to be in the building. Agent Scott claimed in the short term there would be no extra bodies as there are 10 ground floor offices and they have approximately 15 office staff sharing them. But, in the longer term 7 new offices will be added to the upstairs.

Questions to Planner Kuchma

Member Trombino inquired about how there was a letter written against the minor variance, but it was not included in the planning report. Planner Kuchma commented that the letter was received after the planning report was written, she sought clarification from the applicant and he indicated that in the short term they do not anticipate there being increase in the number of employees but rather is it a reallocation of space to accommodate the existing operation and the existing employees. She claimed she also spoke with engineering staff who reviewed the parking justification study that was provided and they were of the opinion that regardless if there was an increase in employees the study is based on the GFA being proposed not the number of employees. Engineering staff was thus satisfied that with the TDM measures that were concluded in the study that it would be satisfactory for the site.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23-018/M) for 56 Steeles Avenue East in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the proposed office area shall be located and constructed in accordance with the site plan and building elevations, prepared by Michael Scott Architect Inc., date stamped by Town Zoning on February 16, 2023.
2. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision.
3. That the approval be subject to 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.
4. That the Owner demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town of Milton that they will be able to achieve all proposed TDM measures outlined in the Parking Justification Study dated November 2022 by LEA Consulting Ltd. including any ongoing programming or management that may be required for program success. All costs associated with the implementation of the TDM measures are the responsibility of the Owner.

Carried

5.7 A23-024M - 557 Hartley Boulevard

Wasiq Hamid Sindhu, Owner, address: 557 Hartley Boulevard, Milton provided an overview of the application.

Questions to Owner Sindhu

Member Ellahi reinstated that when the Committee visits the property to please allow them inside, especially when the subject is inside the house. Member Ellahi also inquired about the stairs being built by the builder, but by looking at the drawings what is being proposed is below grade stairs inside the garage. Owner Sindhu stated the stairs have already been there and were built by the builder.

Chair Kluge inquired about how long the air conditioning unit has been in its current location. Owner Sindhu stated he bought the house this way, and thus doesn't know how long it has been in its location.

Public Participation

Member of the public, Chole, address: 538 Hartley Boulevard inquired if the basement unit was built, how long would it take long what would the noise level be, as lot of people within the neighbourhood work from home. Planner Stopar claimed a building permit by the town would be needed prior to starting construction on the basement apartment. After the issuance of the building permit and during construction the owner would have to comply with standard requirements for construction, and noise by-laws. If there were concerns with construction debris or noise at any time she claimed the member of the public could reach out to the town, where By-law enforcement staff or building division staff could ensure they are in compliance. Member of the public, Chole also inquired if there is any anticipation of a timeline from building to completion. Planner Stopar claimed the building permit wouldn't have a specified time as to when the owners would have to begin and end construction. But rather it would be up to the owner to determine.

Questions to Planner Stopar

Member Ellahi requested clarification whether the stairs inside the garage was built without a building permit, and now the owner is claiming it was as built by the builder. Planner Stopar claimed when this application originally came in they thought the stairs were built without a building permit, however upon further review they did find a building permit from the original owner from 2003, which showed the town had indeed approved below grade stairs within the garage. For this instance, in order for the applicant to utilize the below grade stairs in the garage as the primary entrance for the accessory apartment in the basement, a wall needs to be constructed to enclose those stairs from the side door away from the rest of the garage. Thus, it can't be left as an open area under the building code, which is what is triggering the requirement for the variance. Planner Stopar also confirmed with Zoning Staff, that at time of the original issuance of the building permit back in 2003 the below grade stairs were permitted in the zoning by-law and did not need a minor variance.

Member Slaght inquired whether the issue with the air conditioner is only the fact it is located in the side yard, and that there isn't any setback issues. Planner Stopar claimed her concern with the air conditioner isn't

that it is located within the side yard, but rather she has an issue with the setback. According to the applicant there is a 1.2 metre setback but based on pictures provided it does seem a lot closer than 1.2 metres, she hasn't received enough clarity from the owner to show that there would be sufficient access maintained to the rear yard through the side yard. Member Slaght also inquired if the air conditioner is closer to the side lot line than the setback from the window well to the side lot line. Planner Stopar claimed she couldn't confirm that information, as it doesn't look the air conditioner wasn't necessarily drawn to scale on the site plan.

Chair Kluge inquired what would the liability be of the Town if there was fire in the backyard and the unit is impeding the fire department from accessing the backyard. He also inquired about the window wells in the new basement unit and how you would fall into them first before hitting the air conditioner. Planner Stopar stated the Zoning by-law doesn't have specific requirements where window wells can be located and their setbacks, that is more so the building code that looks at that. Planner Stopar could not answer Chair Kluge's liability question.

Member Jayaveer inquired if the permitted location of the air-conditioner was apart of the disclosure statement from the builder when the original owner purchased the home from the builder, and if this been looked into at all currently to see if this was a discussion back then as to where the air conditioner would be permitted to be located. Planner Stopar claimed she had not reviewed the sub-division agreement registered on title for this property, however through the building permit review for the original dwelling it is required that the builders show where the a/c units are located to ensure compliance with the zoning by-law.

Member Ellahi commented that since this is a corner house and the fence encloses the a/c unit, the unit should be at the back side of the wall instead of the front side. It is now elongated towards the front side, which is why he believes it is creating an issue. Planner Stopar claimed the zoning-by-law would permit the fence of the property in that location, but he is correct in the sense that if the fence was moved farther back there would be more of an access. However the main intent of the zoning by-law requiring the the a/c unit to not be with the exterior front yard is a visual thing, to be able to have it screened from view of the front street.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* , the following minor variance for application 557 Hartley Boulevard, file (A23-024M) in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED**

Variance #1

To permit a garage length of 5.6 metres, whereas the minimum size of a parking space in a garage shall be 6.0 metres long

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision; and

That the approval be subject to 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.

Carried

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act*, the following minor variance for application 557 Hartley Boulevard - File (A23-024/M) in the Town of Milton **BE DENIED**

Variance #2

To permit an air conditioning unit in the exterior side yard with a setback of 1.2 metres whereas an air conditioner unit is only permitted in the rear or interior side yard.

Lost

5.8 A23-019M - 5272 Eighth Line

Claire Riepma, agent of the applicant, address: 220 Kempenfelt Drive, Barrie provided an overview of the application.

Questions to Agent Riepma

Member Ellahi requested clarification from the agent, member Ellahi stated that the variances requested is only for one thing, which is to build and keep two dwellings on one lot. He also stated the Planning Acts only discussed an enlargement and an extension of the building structure, meaning if you have two houses on the land on land you can do an

enlargement and an extension but it never states that you can build a new house and then tear down the existing one. Agent Riepma claimed it is very common in the interpretation of this section of the Planning Act that new buildings are built all the time, and it states enlargement but it is interpreted by the Ontario municipal board and OLT over the years to mean that you can build a bigger building and knock the original one down, which he claimed has been done many times.

Questions to Planner Suffern

Member Ellahi claimed this application is being reviewed in respect to the current by-law and he asked if it is wise to take this application into consideration. Planner Suffern claimed that this type of application does differ from the traditional minor variance applications that are considered throughout Committee of Adjustment meetings. Planner Suffern stated the planning consultant was correct that an application can come forward to expand or alter the legal non-conforming use, however it is at the full discretion of the Committee to determine whether the application is appropriate to approve. Member Ellahi stated his concern is, that if the Committee allows one example of two dwellings in one lot then it will become an example that also continues for other projects. Planner Suffern claimed, it is only a use permitted on this particular subject property. At this point in time under current policy regime it wouldn't be supported for example, if the neighbour down the road wanted to come in with a second principal dwelling. Until the use ceases then the current use of two dwellings can be maintained on the property subject to Committee approval if any additions, expansions, enlargements occur.

Member Jayaveer inquired if this property is within the employment area. Planner Suffern stated that the lands were identified through Regional Official Plan Amendment 49 that they would be brought into the urban boundary at a regional level from a town perspective, they would have to go through conformity exercises to bring those lands into what would be considered a urban boundary at a local level. But, at the time they would be designated employment, however there would be continuous exercises involving secondary planning and eventual zoning by-law amendments to that degree. In terms of timing and phasing it is unclear but is something that will happen down the road. Member Jayaveer's follow up question was, if there are any policies in the official regional plan that speak to prohibiting residential uses, as typically when going through the secondary-plan stage, and you have lands designated for employment area usually there are policies that speak to not developing new

residential uses. Planner Suffern stated, if the applicant came forward without the legal non-conforming use established then it probably wouldn't be something that the town would consider, The non-conforming use is permitted, as those are permissions associated with this property, it was noted that the area will be employment use at some point.

Member Kluge stated that he noticed in the planning report that under ROPA 49 the lands were designated as an urban area for employment uses, but then Halton Region reported no concerns of this application. Planner Suffern stated regional planners do review the proposal in terms of what is currently existing and in terms of what is permitted. From that perspective they do refer to Town Planning staff to determine whether or not it is appropriate. He identified his concern is in the long term we are entrenching a use that they wouldn't want to see in that area.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the *Planning Act* –File (A23-019/M) for 5272 Eighth Line in the Town of Milton **BE DENIED.**

Carried

5.9 A23-021M - 256 Ridge Drive

Marina Huisson, agent of the applicant, address: 29-336 Bronte Street South, Milton provided an overview of the application.

Public Participation

Berry Phillips, address: 250 Ridge Drive. Berry stated his concerns are that with carving the house into a basement and upper apartment is very inconsistent with what he heard the intent was when it was purchased. His interest and concern is what the ultimate purpose is for the property, whether that is a short term rental, long term rental, etc. Planner Suffern claimed secondary units are permitted, and now with Bill-23 up to three units are permitted, so the primary and two accessory. In addition to that from a short-term rental perspective those are permitted in Milton, but subject to a licensing by-law and zoning provisions. In terms of a long term perspective, it continues to be a primary dwelling and a basement apartment. Berry inquired if he will notified if there is application for the property to become a short term rental. Planner Suffern claimed, unless there is a minor variance required to facilitate the conversion,

neighbouring properties would be notified. For example if there is relief required something such as parking, a mailout would be sent out to neighbouring properties. Berry stated that these are variances required to create a separate unit in the basement. Planner Suffern stated in respect to the short term rental piece they would have to get a license from the Town which is something they would continue to look at. From that perspective if there were ever concerns associated with tenants of the short term rental the member of the public can call the by-law department.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

THE APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE under Section 45(1)(2) of the Planning Act –File (A23 – 021/M) for 256 Ridge Drive in the Town of Milton **BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the additional residential unit shall be generally located and constructed in accordance with the site plan and building elevations, prepared by Green Propeller Design, date stamped by Town Zoning on February 28, 2023.
2. That the owner provide a 'No Objections Letter' from Conservation Halton prior to Building Permit issuance.
3. That a building permit application be obtained within two (2) years from the date of this decision.
4. That the approval be subject to 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.

Carried

6. **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, April 27, 2023 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to discuss the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:52 p.m.

Greta Susa, Acting Secretary Treasurer