

Members Present: Dan O'Hara, Angie Desmarais, Gary Bruno, Eric Beauregard

Staff Present: Chris Roome, Planner
Samantha Yeung, Planning Technician/Secretary-Treasurer

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:00pm by Chair Dan O'Hara.

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest:

Member Bruno disclosed that he had a conflict of interest with application A15-22-PC.

2. Requests for Deferrals or Withdrawals of Applications:

The following applications requested deferral:

B09-22-PC
A14-22-PC
A17-22-PC

Motion: Gary Bruno Second: Eric Beauregard
Carried: 4-0

3. New Business

i) Application: A13-22-PC

Action: Minor Variance
Agent: N/A
Owner: Jason & Maureen McCormack
Location: 858 Pleasant Beach Road

The Secretary-Treasurer read the correspondence received for this application.

The applicant did not provide and further comments.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Committee.

That minor variance application A13-22-PC be **granted** for the following reasons:

1. **Minor in nature** as the increase in height will not negatively impact the subject parcel or neighbouring properties. The structure is located a reasonable distance from the lot lines and will not result in visibility concerns.
2. **Appropriate for development of the site** as the development is located in a suitable location on the site.
3. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-Law** as accessory structures are permitted in the HR zone and the proposal meets the setbacks and lot coverage requirements.
4. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan** as accessory structures are permitted in the Hamlet designation.

Motion: Gary Bruno

Seconded: Angie Desmarais

Carries: 4-0

ii) Application: A16-22-PC

Action: Minor Variance

Agent: N/A

Owner: Darrell Ryan

Location: 134 Rosemount Ave.

The Secretary-Treasurer read the correspondence received for this application.

The applicant stated that the water, hydro, and sewer services for the accessory structure will be connect to the main house on the property. He said that the size (footprint) of the house meets the by-law. He also stated that the windows overlooking the neighbouring lot will be 19 ft which meets the 6 meter height, and that there are other windows on other properties also overlooking the neighbouring lot.

Member Beauregard asked if the proposed structure would meet the spatial separation requirements for glazed openings and wall constructions as per the Ontario Building Code.

The applicant responded by saying that it would be done by an architect so they would meet those requirements.

Member Beauregard asked if the applicant knows if the proposed structure would comply with the requirements now.

The applicant responded yes as far as he knows. The architects started the drawings and he applied for the minor variance to move forward.

The Chair asked if the building would have sewer and water connections.

The applicant responded yes, and it would be patched into the existing sewer and water to the house.

The Chair asked if the purpose of connecting the proposed building to sewer and water would be to simply have a washroom in the garage.

The applicant responded yes.

The Chair asked if there are any plans to turn it into living quarters.

The applicant responded possibly in the future the upper storey could be converted into an in-law suite.

The Chair asked if the living quarters was part of this application.

The Planner responded no, this application was processed only for a height variance. If the applicant proposed to convert the unit into an in-law suite, the Planning Department will have to re-review the proposal to determine if it meets the zoning by-law.

The Chair confirmed that the applicant is aware that they would have to apply for a building permit for when they convert the unit to an accessory dwelling unit.

The applicant responded yes.

The Chair asked if they had gotten their permit yet.

The applicant responded no.

That minor variance application A16-22-PC be **granted** for the following reasons:

1. **Minor in nature** as the increase in height from 6 m to 7.68 m will not negatively impact the subject parcel or neighbouring properties, and the structure is located at a reasonable distance from all lot lines, therefore the increase in height will not result in visibility issues.
2. **Appropriate for development of the site** as the proposal is located in a suitable location on the site.
3. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-Law** as accessory structures are permitted in the R1 zone and the

proposal meets the setbacks and lot coverage requirements and will be accessory in nature to the principal dwelling.

4. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan** as accessory structures are permitted in the Urban Residential area.

Motion: Angie Desmarais

Seconded: Gary Bruno

Carried: 4-0

iii) Application: A15-22-PC

Action: Minor Variance

Agent: Jason Pizzicarola

Owners: Ralph & Lynda Rotella

Location: 119 Neff Street

Member Bruno left the meeting at this time due to a conflict of interest.

The Secretary-Treasurer read the correspondence received for this application.

The agent communicated that there is additional parking on Neff Street for visitors. He also stated that the renter demographic is mostly seniors, and that there regularly seems to be many parking spaces available.

Member Desmarais stated that it doesn't build well to the future in case the renter demographic changes to younger people, and that taking up all the Neff Street parking would be unfair to residents.

The Agent responded by saying that there will always be a need for senior housing, and being in the downtown core close to amenities, he doesn't feel reduced parking would become an issue. He also stated many other projects in the Region have approved 1:1 parking.

Member Desmarais suggested that the agent discuss with the owner the possibility of designating part of the building to seniors.

The Chair confirmed that the proposal is to add 2 storeys to the existing building.

The Agent responded yes.

The Chair noted that he saw the parking lot about 50% full on Sunday afternoon. He also asked if the Main Street entrance was blocked off because it's a more major road.

The Agent responded that he was not sure.

The Chair suggested that if the entrance off Main St. was permanently closed off, that space could facilitate more parking spaces.

That minor variance application A15-22-PC be **granted** for the following reasons:

1. **Minor in nature** as the requested variance is considered a reasonable and measured request.
2. **Appropriate for development of the site** as the proposal is located in a suitable location on the site apartments are permitted in the DC zone.
3. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-Law** as the DC zone is permits apartments and the proposal meets the setbacks and lot coverage requirements.
4. **Desirable and in compliance with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan** as the official plan permits apartments in the Downtown Commercial Designation.

Motion: Eric Beauregard

Seconded: Angie Desmarais

Carried: 4-0

4. Other Business:

Member Bruno re-entered the meeting at this time.

Member Beauregard asked, regarding the applications that were deferred because the region didn't provide comments, how long the Region had to provide those comments.

The Planner responded that the Region was given adequate time according to the MOU. However, for both applications, the Region gave the applicants a checklist of requirements to meet before their inspection, and these requirements were not met.

Member Bruno asked if when the region wants more information on an application, to then not provide the applicant with anything further that might be a shortcoming. The Region should be forthcoming with all things as though the application was going through.

The Chair responded by discussing that the sequencing of the application process will be revised to address issues like this.

The Planner responded that in the instance of this month, the Region did their due diligence. The Planner also discussed the new application process that the department will be shifting towards, including doing away with application deadlines.

Member Bruno suggested the possibility of collecting the Region and NPCA fee initially, and then refunding it if its not required.

The Planner responded that if a recommendation is made for an application and the Region wasn't circulated, they could appeal it. He also stated that consent applications outside of the urban boundary attend a mandatory pre-consultation meeting, where it is identified if the Region requires circulation or not.

Member Beauregard asked if pre-consultation is always required.

The Planner responded no, it is at the discretion of staff. Consents outside the urban boundary are mandatory for pre-consultation.

Member Beauregard clarified that no pre-con is required for consents inside the urban boundary.

The Planner responded yes, and that it is the same for NPCA.

Member Beauregard asked if any informal conversation with planning is required.

The Planner responded that there is usually a discussion with planning staff about the application.

Member Beauregard asked if the new application process would make it quicker for the applicant.

The Planner responded that it may not necessarily make it quicker for the applicant, but the process would be more streamlined.

Member Beauregard expressed concerns over delays for applicants. He then asked how quickly planning receives comments from agencies.

The Planner responded that as per the MOU comments are supposed to be received within 10 days for minor variances and 14 days for consents, and that the Region is usually able to meet that. The NPCA sometimes takes longer. He explained the department typically receives comments within 10-20 days.

Member Beauregard asked if it could then potentially take 20 days to get a response as to if the agencies want to be circulated.

The Planner responded no, they asked how many days they will need to determine if they need to be circulated, the region responded 5 business days and the NPCA responded 7 business days.

Member Desmarais expressed concerns with multiple applications for the same property and explained that it would be helpful to see the history of the application in the report.

The Planner responded that they could do that.

The Chair explained that Committee of Adjustment is back in person, looking to be fully in person by next month, with the opportunity to be virtual if necessary. He stated that the Committee of Adjustment will still be broadcasted online.

5. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes from the May 11th, 2022, meetings were approved.

Motioned: Gary Bruno Seconded: Eric Beauregard
Carried: 4-0

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:50 pm.