



# Minutes of the 9th Meeting

## Committee of Adjustment

---

**Meeting Date:** Thursday July 8, 2021

**Meeting Time:** 7:00 p.m.

**Meeting Location:** Virtual Meeting

---

### **Present:**

N. Chornobay, Chair

S. Haslam

J. Cardwell

B. O'Carroll

D. McCarroll

J. Malfara, Secretary-Treasurer

J. Taylor, Senior Manager, Zoning & Regulation

### **Item 1: Disclosure of Interest:**

There was no disclosure of interest by the members of the Committee of Adjustment

**Carried**

## **Item 2: Public Hearings**

**A/64/21**

**Steve DeNoble on behalf of Tammy Shannon  
56 Meadow Crescent (Severed Lands)**

An application has been received from Steve DeNoble on behalf of Tammy Shannon, for variances from the provisions of the Town of Whitby Zoning By-law 1784.

The application is for permission to (1) reduce the minimum required lot frontage from 21.5m to 19.0m; (2) increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 35%; (3) reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 10.5m to 7.5m; (4) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.5m; and (5) reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m.

The requested variances are required to permit the severance of the subject property into two parcels, and to also permit the construction of a two storey detached dwelling on the subject property.

In Support of Application

Dustin DeNoble  
Steve DeNoble  
Carmen Calabrese

In Opposition of Application

Barry French  
Sheila Raitt  
Kevin Kelly  
Martha Kelly  
Karen Pratt  
Brian Pratt  
Carol Cooper  
Suzanne Cooper  
Doug Wright  
Heather Wright  
Robert Ward  
Michael Sigsworth  
Sharron Field  
Michael Mohammed  
Dieter Germann  
Les Brindley  
Richard Matthews  
Kimberly Van Winden  
Chuck Van Winden  
Bernard Lewis  
Lesley Lewis  
Amy Dickinson  
Susan Dickinson  
Joanne Stycuk  
Arthur Armstrong

The Chair introduced the application and asked if anyone would like to speak to the subject application.

S. DeNoble introduced himself to the Committee as one of the owners of the subject property. He provide a brief overview of the requested variances and a summary of the proposed work schedule.

S. DeNoble also expressed to the Committee that his intent is to construct a dwelling for his son and that his partner's intent is to construct a home for his daughter on the severed and retained lands, and that the proposed dwellings will not be offered for sale to the public.

The Chair asked if there were any questions from the Committee.

J. Cardwell asked the applicant if there were any plans that could be shared.

S. DeNoble replied yes. He provided two comparables that were recently constructed in Whitby. He concluded that homes similar to what is illustrated could be constructed on the severed and retained lots.

J. Malfara shared the plans on the screen for the Committee and members of the public to view, and noted that the plans were circulated to known interested parties in advance of the meeting.

The Chair asked if there were any additional questions from the Committee.

S. Haslam noted that the Town is recommending that the proposed covered front porch be limited to one storey in height and that the main portion of the dwelling maintain a minimum 9.0m front yard setback. He asked the applicant if this is acceptable.

S. DeNoble replied yes.

The Chair asked if there were any additional questions from the Committee.

D. McCarroll asked the applicant if he is set on the style of buildings, as illustrated by the comparables that were shared with the Committee and public.

S. DeNoble replied yes. He referred to this type of building typology as a bungalow.

S. DeNoble expressed that he has no objection to the Town's Urban Design Department reviewing the proposed building designs prior to any construction activities taking place.

The Chair asked Planning Staff to provide a brief overview of the term architectural control for members of the public.

J. Malfara stated that the Town of Whitby has an urban design team within the Planning Department. They are able to provide detailed comments and recommendations to proposed building elevations, massing, and overall designs to ensure that the proposal represents a high standard of architectural design.

J. Malfara advised that if the Committee sees fit, they can include a condition of approval that would require approval from the Town's Urban Design Division with regards to the dwelling designs.

The Chair asked if there were any additional questions from the Committee. There were none.

The Chair asked J. Malfara, Secretary-Treasurer, if any correspondence had been received in relation to the subject application.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that numerous emails were received from the community, and these comments were provided to the Committee for their review prior to the meeting.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

D. Wright introduced himself to the Committee. He was also joined by his wife H. Wright. They are the owners of the property at 60 Meadow Cres.

D. Wright stated that the requested variances are not minor in nature. He noted that the variances would result in an excessively large dwelling on each of the proposed lots. D. Wright stated that the proposal would result in dwellings that are not in keeping with the neighbourhood character, would result in the loss of five mature trees, and would set a precedent for future development in the neighbourhood.

D. Wright further stated that the massing of the proposed dwellings would result in visual and shadowing impacts on his property. It was his understanding that only one storey dwellings were permitted in the neighbourhood, and the proposed two storey dwellings would not blend with the surrounding land uses.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments from the Committee or applicant.

S. DeNoble stated that Mr. Wright's property has the same lot frontage as what is proposed on the severed and retained lots.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

K. Kelly introduced himself to the Committee and stated that the proposal would not result in any added value to the neighbourhood. The proposal would result in visual impacts from the dwellings and loss of vegetation. K. Kelly noted that his main concerns relate to the increase in lot coverage, not necessarily the lot frontage reduction.

K. Kelly stated that the increase in lot coverage is not minor in nature, and the proposal of two storey dwellings would not be in keeping with the surrounding area, which is primarily characterized by one storey dwellings.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

C. Calabrese introduced himself to the Committee as one of the applicants. He concluded that the lot coverage increase would result in a dwelling that is approximately 2,200.0 sq. ft in size which is not out of character.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

K. Pratt introduced herself and husband (B. Pratt) as the owners of 73 Meadow Cres. She advised the Committee that the requested variances are not minor in nature. She noted that the proposal would result in safety issues due to the road configuration, lack of sidewalks, traffic, and the potential for increased on-street parking.

B. O'Carroll noted that the proposed garages would be setback further from the street, in comparison to the main dwelling, thereby increasing the amount of usable driveway space.

S. DeNoble stated that a minimum of four parking spaces could be accommodated on the driveway and an additional two spaces in the garage for a total of six parking spaces.

B. Pratt stated that they are new to the neighborhood, and he has noticed that this street is frequently used by local residents for walking, and increased traffic may result in safety issues.

K. Pratt asked if this application is approved, would it be precedent setting for future redevelopment applications?

The Chair stated that anyone can apply for a Minor Variance application and the Committee is here to speak to this specific application only and judge it on its own merit.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

M. Sigsworth introduced himself to the Committee as the owner of 63 Meadow Cres. He advised the Committee that this is a quiet neighborhood and if approved, this application will be precedent setting for future proposals in the direct area. M. Sigsworth noted that there is ample land in other areas in Whitby, and that these neighborhoods should be preserved.

M. Sigsworth referenced the Town of Whitby Official Plan. He noted several excerpts of the Official Plan and concluded that the proposal is not in keeping with these sections.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application.

B. Lewis introduced himself to the Committee as the owner of 77 Meadow Cres. It was his understanding that only one storey dwellings were permitted on this street. He is also concerned with the massing and size of the proposed dwellings, and that the dwellings will be sold to the general market and not actually to the family members of the applicant.

S. Haslam asked if there are any By-law provisions in place to restrict the height of the dwellings to one storey.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that the maximum permitted building height for the subject lands is 8.5m. The By-law does not limit the number of storeys, as long as the building height does not exceed 8.5m.

The Chair asked what the approximate height of a 2 storey building is.

J. Malfara replied that an 8.5m tall building can permit two storeys. Staff have observed slightly taller building heights required for modern dwellings where slightly greater floor to ceiling heights are desired.

S. DeNoble emphasised that the existing lots located at 60 and 62 Meadow Cres are the same size as what he is proposing.

A. Dickinson introduced herself to the Committee. She asked the applicant why he chose this neighborhood to construct the two proposed dwellings. She also noted that she shares the same concerns as the other residents who spoke prior to her.

S. DeNoble replied that the opportunity presented itself and this is an area that his son would like to live in.

S. Raitt introduced herself as the owner of 59 Meadow Cres. She advised the Committee that she also grew up in this neighborhood, and has come to recognize that for each lot that is severed and redeveloped results in an increase in traffic and vehicles. S. Raitt also noted that this proposal would result in a loss of greenspace and mature vegetation and that the guiding principals in the Town of Whitby Official Plan are not being met.

S. Raitt asked the Committee if the Committee has visited the neighborhood and if the applicant's family are bound to live in the proposed dwellings.

The Chair stated that each of the Committee members have visited the area on multiple occasions.

The Chair also noted that the Town can not restrict who lives in the dwellings and/or how long they have to live in a dwelling.

S. DeNoble advised the Committee that he constructed his own home in Whitby 28 years ago, and continues to reside at this residence.

D. Wright noted that he has no objection to the size of the proposed lots, rather they are primarily concerned with the proposed lot coverage, impacts of existing vegetation, and massing of the proposed dwellings.

S. DeNoble advised the Committee that they will try to preserve as much vegetation as possible. He noted that some trees will be impacted, but it is too early to confirm which trees specifically will be impacted.

B. O'Carroll noted that private trees can be removed by home owners.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that the Town does not have a private tree cutting by-law. With certain exceptions, trees located on private properties can be removed by home owners.

M. Sigsworth asked the Committee what steps have been taken to ensure that neighborhoods like Meadow Crescent are preserved.

J. Taylor advised the Committee that initiatives such as Architectural Control have proven successful in preserving neighborhood character when new development is proposed. J. Taylor also expressed that variances for increased lot coverage have also been applied for, and approved by the Committee within proximity to the subject property. J. Taylor also noted that anyone on Meadow Crescent can construct a two storey dwelling without any additional approvals, as long as the proposed dwelling is within the 8.5m height restriction.

M. Sigsworth asked who he can speak with about expressing his views regarding how future development is addressed in mature neighborhoods.

J. Taylor advised M. Sigsworth that he can speak with his local Councillor as well as provide input to the Town's Zoning By-law review process and mature neighborhood study.

K. Kelly noted that he can not dispute what the By-law currently permits. However, in his opinion the requested variances do not meet the four Planning Act tests.

K. Kelly asked the Committee what would prevent the variances from being approved.

J. Malfara noted that the Planning Act sets out the four tests required to make a decision on a Minor Variance application. J. Malfara read out the four tests.

J. Taylor also noted that the Committee can approve, deny, or table the application.

J. Taylor also provided a brief overview of appeal rights to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

The Chair asked if the Committee was ready to make a motion on this item.

J. Cardwell asked J. Malfara to provide an overview of the conditions of approval, any additional conditions that may be suitable, and the lot area variance amendment to the application.

J. Malfara and J. Taylor advised the Committee that an additional variance was required. This variance would be noted as Variance #5 and is required to reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m.

S. Haslam stated that he was willing to make a motion to approve variances 1, 3, 4, and 5, and table variance 2 to a future Committee of Adjustment meeting.

In addition the two conditions outlined in the staff report, S. Haslam's motion also included the following additional conditions.

1. the building elevations are to be in keeping with the photographs and elevations submitted by the applicants;
2. the building design be subject to Town of Whitby in-house architectural control approval; and
3. the applicant receive final and binding approval from the Durham Region Land Division Committee

The Chair asked J. Malfara to confirm that the architectural control would be conducted by the Town of Whitby Planning Department.

J. Malfara replied yes.

**Moved by:** S. Haslam

The application to (1) reduce the minimum required lot frontage from 21.5m to 19.0m; (3) reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 10.5m to 7.5m; (4) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.0m; and (5) reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m located at 56 Meadow Crescent be **Granted**, and variance (2) to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 35% be **Tabled** to a future meeting pending the Committees review of an acceptable siting plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. All Public Works requirements related to Land Division application LD 072/2021 are complied with ;
2. The proposed covered front porch be limited to one storey in height and that the main portion of the dwelling maintain a minimum 9.0m front yard setback.
3. the building elevations are to be in keeping with the photographs and elevations submitted by the applicants;
4. that the building design be subject to Town of Whitby in-house architectural control approval; and
5. the applicant receive final and binding approval from the Durham Region Land Division Committee

J. Malfara and J. Taylor advised the Committee that it is their understanding that the motion is to approve Parts 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the variance request subject to conditions and subject to receipt of further information regarding Part 2 of the variance request (being a variance to the coverage restrictions). As a result, only Part 2 of the variance



was tabled and will be added to the agenda of a future Committee meeting upon receipt of additional information from the applicant regarding the variance request for coverage. A Notice of Decision will be issued upon full consideration and a decision being made by the Committee on Part 2 of the overall variance request.

**Carried**

Reason: The members of the Committee were of the opinion that the approved variances are minor in nature; that the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan is being maintained, and further that the granting of the application is desirable and would result in the appropriate development of the property.

Having considered the contents of all submissions, the staff report and oral submissions had an effect on the Committee's decision.

## **Item 2: Public Hearings**

**A/65/21**

**Steve DeNoble on behalf of Tammy Shannon  
56 Meadow Crescent (Retained Lands)**

An application has been received from Steve DeNoble on behalf of Tammy Shannon, for variances from the provisions of the Town of Whitby Zoning By-law 1784.

The application is for permission to (1) reduce the minimum required lot frontage from 21.5m to 19.0m; (2) increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 35%; (3) reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 10.5m to 7.5m; (4) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.5m; and (5) reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m.

The requested variances are required to permit the severance of the subject property into two parcels, and to also permit the construction of a two storey detached dwelling on the subject property.

In Support of Application

Dustin DeNoble  
Steve DeNoble  
Carmen Calabrese

In Opposition of Application

Barry French  
Sheila Raitt  
Kevin Kelly  
Martha Kelly  
Karen Pratt  
Brian Pratt  
Carol Cooper  
Suzanne Cooper  
Doug Wright  
Heather Wright  
Robert Ward  
Michael Sigsworth  
Sharron Field  
Michael Mohammed  
Dieter Germann  
Les Brindley  
Richard Matthews  
Kimberly Van Winden  
Chuck Van Winden  
Bernard Lewis  
Lesley Lewis  
Amy Dickinson  
Susan Dickinson  
Joanne Stycuk  
Arthur Armstrong

The Chair introduced the application and asked if anyone had any information or comments that they would like to share, in addition to comments presented with application A/64/21.

S. Denoble stated that he has no additional comments from what was previously discussed in application A/64/21.

S. DeNoble asked J. Malfara to provide clarity on the condition pertaining to the front yard setback.

J. Malfara provided an overview of the proposed conditions as outlined in the Planning Staff Report.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments from the members of the public.

J. Malfara noted that correspondence received from the previously application A/64/21 was also applicable to this application.

D. Wright expressed that in his opinion that requested variances are not desirable and appropriate for the development of the subject lands and neighborhood.

D. Wright advised the Committee that notwithstanding Provincial policy directives, the views of local residents should also be considered in this process.

The Chair confirmed that the public's input is being considered as part of the decision making process.

The Chair asked if there were any additional comments from the public. There were none.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application. There was no one.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that an additional variance was required, similar to application A/64/21. This variance would be noted as Variance #5 and is required to reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m.

S. Haslam stated that he was willing to make a motion to approve variances 1, 3, 4, and 5, and table variance 2 to a future Committee of Adjustment meeting.

In addition the two conditions outlined in the staff report, S. Haslam's motion also included the following additional conditions.

1. the building elevations are to be in keeping with the photographs and elevations submitted by the applicants;
2. the building design be subject to Town of Whitby in-house architectural control approval; and
3. the applicant receive final and binding approval from the Durham Region Land Division Committee

The Chair asked J. Malfara to confirm that the architectural control would be conducted by the Town of Whitby Planning Department.

J. Malfara replied yes.

**Moved by:** S. Haslam

The application to (1) reduce the minimum required lot frontage from 21.5m to 19.0m; (3) reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 10.5m to 7.5m; (4) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.0m; and (5) reduce the minimum required lot area from 925 sq. m to 725 sq. m located at 56 Meadow Crescent be **Granted**, and variance (2) to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 35% be **Tabled** to a future meeting pending the Committees review of an acceptable siting plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. All Public Works requirements related to Land Division application LD 072/2021 are complied with ;
2. The proposed covered front porch be limited to one storey in height and that the main portion of the dwelling maintain a minimum 9.0m front yard setback.
3. the building elevations are to be in keeping with the photographs and elevations submitted by the applicants;
4. that the building design be subject to Town of Whitby in-house architectural control approval; and
5. the applicant receive final and binding approval from the Durham Region Land Division Committee

J. Malfara and J. Taylor advised the Committee that it is their understanding that the motion is to approve Parts 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the variance request subject to conditions and subject to receipt of further information regarding Part 2 of the variance request (being a variance to the coverage restrictions). As a result, only Part 2 of the variance was tabled and will be added to the agenda of a future Committee meeting upon receipt of additional information from the applicant regarding the variance request for coverage. A Notice of Decision will be issued upon full consideration and a decision being made by the Committee on Part 2 of the overall variance request.

**Carried**

Reason: The members of the Committee were of the opinion that the approved variances are minor in nature; that the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan is being maintained, and further that the granting of the application is desirable and would result in the appropriate development of the property.

Having considered the contents of all submissions, the staff report and oral submissions had an effect on the Committee's decision.

## **Item 2: Public Hearings**

**A/66/21**

**Laura Butler**

**7940 Thickson Road North**

An application has been received from Laura Butler, for variances from the provisions of the Town of Whitby Zoning By-law 1784.

The application is for permission to (1) increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 10% to 13.5%, (2) reduce the minimum required rear yard setback to an accessory structure from 15.0m to 7.4m; and (3) reduce the exterior side yard setback from 15.0m to 13.0m.

The requested variances are required to recognize an existing accessory structure ("lean to"/porch) located on the subject property.

In Support of Application

Laura Butler

Brett Degras

In Opposition of Application

None at this time.

The Chair introduced the application and asked if anyone would like to speak to the subject application.

L. Butler introduced herself as the applicant and owner of the subject property. She advised the Committee that a variance was previously approved to permit the construction of a detached garage on the subject property.

L. Butler noted that a covered porch was constructed and attached to the garage. The porch was constructed 4 years ago, but it was recently determined that a permit was needed for this type of work. It was also determined that the porch would require variances from the By-law.

The Chair asked if there were any questions from the Committee.

S. Haslam asked if the porch was for personal use.

L. Butler replied yes.

B. O'Carroll expressed that in the notice the structure is described as a lean-to structure, whereas the staff report identifies the structure as a porch. For future applications, B. O'Carroll asked that the terminology be consistent.

The Chair asked J. Malfara, Secretary-Treasurer, if any correspondence had been received in relation to the subject application.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that no public correspondence was received.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application. There was no one.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that the following condition of approval be included.

1. That no permits be issued until CLOCA is satisfied, financially and otherwise.

**Moved by:** J. Cardwell

That the application to (1) increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 10% to 13.5%, (2) reduce the minimum required rear yard setback to an accessory structure from 15.0m to 7.4m; and (3) reduce the exterior side yard setback from 15.0m to 13.0m located at 7940 Thickson Road North be **Granted**, subject to the following condition.

1. That no permits be issued until CLOCA is satisfied, financially and otherwise.

**Carried**

Reason: The members of the Committee were of the opinion that the variances are minor in nature; that the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan is being maintained, and further that the granting of the application is desirable and would result in the appropriate development of the property.

Having considered the contents of all submissions, the staff report and oral submissions had an effect on the Committee's decision.

## **Item 2: Public Hearings**

**A/67/21**

**Eric & Jennifer Norrmalm**

**11 George Street**

An application has been received from Eric & Jennifer Norrmalm, for variances from the provisions of the Town of Whitby Zoning By-law 1784.

The application is for permission to (1) increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 25%; (2) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.0m; and, (3) increase the maximum permitted size of an accessory structure from 60.0 sq.m to 79.0 sq.m.

The requested variances are required to permit the construction of a new two storey detached dwelling and accessory structure on the subject property.

In Support of Application

Eric Norrmalm  
Jennifer Norrmalm

In Opposition of Application

None at this time.

The Chair introduced the application and asked if anyone would like to speak to the subject application.

E. Norrmalm introduced himself to the Committee. He advised the Committee that the variances are required to permit the construction of their proposed dwelling and an accessory structure (detached garage) located within the rear yard.

The Chair asked the applicant to confirm that Variance #1 is no longer required.

E. Norrmalm replied yes.

The Chair asked if there were any questions from the Committee.

J. Cardwell asked if any trees will be removed.

E. Norrmalm replied that a maple tree will likely have to be removed, but they would like to preserve the other trees on the property.

The Chair asked J. Malfara, Secretary-Treasurer, if any correspondence had been received in relation to the subject application.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that no public correspondence was received.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application. There was no one.

**Moved by: B. O'Carroll**

That the application to (1) increase the maximum permitted building height from 8.5m to 9.0m; and, (2) increase the maximum permitted size of an accessory structure from 60.0 sq.m to 79.0 sq.m located at 11 George Street be **Granted** subject to the following conditions:

1. The site grading and services shall conform to the requirements of this department; and
2. Roof leaders from the proposed structures shall not spill onto the neighbouring property

**Carried**

Reason: The members of the Committee were of the opinion that the variances are minor in nature; that the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan is being maintained, and further that the granting of the application is desirable and would result in the appropriate development of the property.

Having considered the contents of all submissions, the staff report and oral submissions had an effect on the Committee's decision.



## **Item 2: Public Hearings**

**A/68/21**

**James Pitre on behalf of Taryn Ito**

**90 Meadow Crescent**

An application has been received from James Pitre on behalf of Taryn Ito, for a variance from the provisions of the Town of Whitby Zoning By-law 1784.

The application is for permission to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 26%.

The requested variance is required to permit the construction of an accessory structure (pool cabana) within the rear yard of the subject property.

In Support of Application

James Pitre

In Opposition of Application

None at this time

The Chair introduced the application and asked if anyone would like to speak to the subject application.

J. Pitre introduced himself to the Committee. He advised the Committee that the requested variance is required to permit a pool cabana structure located at the rear of the property. The proposed structure would exceed the maximum lot coverage by 6%. In his opinion, the requested variance meets the 4 tests as outlined by the Planning Act.

The Chair asked if there were any comments from the Committee.

B. O'Carroll asked the applicant if they were aware of the conditions proposed by the Town of Whitby Public Works Department.

J. Pitre replied yes.

The Chair asked J. Malfara, Secretary-Treasurer, if any correspondence had been received in relation to the subject application.

J. Malfara advised the Committee that a letter was received from Katherine Rocchio on behalf of Maddalena and Pasquale Rocchio, the owners of 8 Eaton Court. Their concerns were in relation to noise, privacy, visual impacts that may result from the proposed cabana structure.

J. Pitre noted that the proposed structure is not anticipated to result in any noise or privacy impacts associated with the swimming pool.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak to the subject application. There was no one.

**Moved by:** D. McCarroll

That the application to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage from 20% to 26% located at 90 Meadow Crescent be **Granted** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site grading and all other services conform to the requirements of the Public Works Department; and
2. Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the Applicant shall provide to Public Works Department for their review and approval an acceptable Grading Plan and Stormwater Management Brief, demonstrating the feasibility of the proposal.

**Carried**

Reason: The members of the Committee were of the opinion that the variance is minor in nature; that the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan is being maintained, and further that the granting of the application is desirable and would result in the appropriate development of the property.

Having considered the contents of all submissions, the staff report and oral submissions had an effect on the Committee's decision.

### **Item 3: Approval of Previous Minutes**

**Moved by:** B. O'Carroll

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment held on Thursday June 17, 2021 be adopted.

**Carried**

### **Item 4: Other Business**

With regards to A/64/21 and A/65/21 J. Taylor advised the Committee that approving certain variance and tabling others that are part of the same application can become difficult to address from an administrative point of view. He advised the Committee that a notice will be sent out to the interested parties to advise them of the specific variances that were approved and advise the interested parties that the next meeting will only be addressing the tabled variances.

### **Item 5: Adjournment**

**Moved by:** B. O'Carroll

That this meeting of the Committee of Adjustment be adjourned.

**Carried**

[Original approved]

---

Secretary Treasurer

[Original approved]

---

Chair