



City of
Peterborough

Committee of Adjustment Minutes

May 25 and 30, 2022

Minutes of an Electronic Meeting of Committee of Adjustment held on Wednesday, May 25 and 30, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Stewart Hamilton, Chair (May 25 and 30)
Mauro DiCarlo (May 30)
Claude Dufresne (May 30)
Tom Green (May 30)
Robert Short (May 30)

Also Present: Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research (May 30)
Andrea Stillman, Zoning Administrator (May 30)
Jennifer Sawatzky, Secretary-Treasurer (May 25 and 30)
Alexey Shcherbin, Assistant Planner (May 25 and 30)

Committee of Adjustment was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

The Chair determined that quorum was not achieved and adjourned the meeting to Monday, May 30, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

The Committee of Adjustment reconvened at 6:02 p.m. May 30, 2022.

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

There were no disclosures of Pecuniary Interest.

Applications

1. File Nos. B06/21, A44/21, and A45/21, 1033 Water Street

This matter relates to a severance application and two minor variance applications submitted by Peter Barton, Kim Barton, Bryan Barton, and Brittney Barton, the owners of the property that is the subject of the application.

The purpose of the consent application is to sever the southerly 10.06 metres of the subject property to create a new residential lot. Minor Variance applications have also been filed to facilitate the creation of the new lot. File number A44/21 relates to the severed lands and proposes to reduce the minimum lot width from 12 metres to 10.06 metres and increase the maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas from 20% to 25.5%. File number A45/21 relates to the retained lands and proposes to reduce the minimum lot width from 12 metres to 10.06 metres.

Peter Barton and Bryan Barton attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- They have reviewed the staff report and recommendation to the Committee.
- Under the existing zoning regulations, they can construct a secondary suite in a detached accessory building on the property. A one-storey dwelling just under 1,100 square feet could be achieved on the property without the City collecting the development charges or property taxes that they would receive from a property under separate ownership. They indicated that this scenario does not allow for the development of affordable housing, as a secondary suite cannot be purchased separately from the main unit.
- Additionally, a secondary suite could be placed closer to the street line to maximize backyard amenity space than the proposed development before the committee. The property would be serviced by the two existing driveways with vehicles backing out onto Water Street. Both driveways are within the road allowance in the event of a future road widening.
- Should the Committee grant approval of the proposed severance, a new, detached dwelling would be created, creating affordable housing, and providing development charges and on-going tax revenue for the City. With the eventual widening of Water Street, only one driveway would be located within the road allowance, with the driveway for the new lot established as per the plan prepared by Trans-Plan, which allows for a turn-around so that cars enter Water Street in a forward-facing direction.
- Both options result in the development of a new, detached dwelling with the only difference the presence of a property line between the houses.

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

No one spoke in objection to the application and no written objections were received.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planner, Policy and Research advised as follows:

- If a Building Permit application for a secondary suite were to come forward, the plan would not necessarily match the proposal before the Committee. The plan would have to be reviewed under the Secondary Suite regulations in the Zoning

By-law with respect to building height and footprint. A secondary suite in an accessory structure is subordinate to the main dwelling, being smaller in size and limited to two bedrooms, and the proposed two-storey dwelling would likely not comply with the regulations. The parking configuration of a secondary suite would be reviewed for zoning compliance at the time of the building permit application. Fewer parking spaces are required for secondary suites than for principal dwelling units.

- The Official Plan policies with respect to intensification inform staff's recommendation for denial of this proposal. The current Official Plan policy as it relates to development in this section of Water Street favours land assembly to achieve developments of greater density rather than severances of individual lots. This application for severance does not align with the policies and direction of the Official Plan. A Secondary Suite application typically does not require Planning Act approvals, and the policies of the Official Plan do not form part of the Building Permit review.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant advised as follows:

- They understand that the applications are being reviewed under the requirements under the Planning Act for consent as well as the four tests of a minor variance. They have provided all of the required documentation to the City for the applications and demonstrated that a parking configuration with the required turning movements can be achieved to address the concerns about backing out onto the arterial road.

Moved by Robert Short

That the applications be denied in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report.

"CARRIED"

Decision – B06/21

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be denied as per the Staff Recommendation.

In that the dimensions of the proposed lots and location of the subject lands along an arterial road are not suitable for the proposed lot configuration, the proposed parking configuration does not conform to the policies in the City of Peterborough Official Plan, and the creation of two narrow lots on the high-capacity arterial will compromise the ability for more suitable redevelopment opportunities, the application to sever the southerly 10.06 metres of the subject property to create a new residential lot is **DENIED**.

Decision – A44/21

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be denied as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variances are not minor, the proposal is not desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are not maintained.

Therefore, variances to Section 7.2 (c) to reduce the minimum lot width to 10.06 metres and to Section 7.2 (j) to increase the maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas to 25.5% are **DENIED**.

Decision – A45/21

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be denied as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variance is not minor, the proposal is not desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are not maintained.

Therefore, a variance to Section 7.2 (c) to reduce the minimum lot width to 10.06 metres is **DENIED**.

2. File No., A13/22, 430 Sheridan Street

This item was deferred from the April 26, 2022 hearing.

This matter relates to a minor variance application submitted by Nora Mickee, the owner of the property that is the subject of the application.

The purpose of the application is to reduce the minimum floor area per dwelling unit from 80 square metres to 63 square metres to facilitate the conversion of the ground floor commercial space into a dwelling unit.

Nora Mickee attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- She has nothing additional to add to the information provided to the Committee in the application.

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

No additional comments were received with respect to this application from PepsiCo Foods Canada.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planner, Policy and Research advised as follows:

- Staff reached out to PepsiCo immediately following the April hearing and received no response. PepsiCo have not provided any additional information or clarification on their concerns.
- The applicant has not discussed the objection to the application with PepsiCo.

Moved by Stewart Hamilton

That the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report.

“CARRIED”

Decision

The Committee heard from members of the public concerning the application and gave due consideration and weight to the comments made and received.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be approved as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variance is minor, the proposal is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are maintained.

Therefore, a variance is granted to Section 103.3 (g) of the Zoning By-law to reduce the minimum floor area per dwelling unit to 63 square metres PROVIDED THAT construction related to the approval proceed substantially in accordance with the concept plan attached as Exhibit C to the Staff Report dated May 25, 2022.

3. File No., A17/22, 78 and 82 Lansdowne Street West

This matter relates to a minor variance application submitted by Neil Campbell, Aside Architects Inc., as applicant on behalf of 885073 Ontario Limited and Lance King, the owners of the properties that are the subject of the application.

The purpose of the application is to increase the maximum number of dwelling units per building from 16 to 19; reduce the minimum lot area per dwelling unit from 185 square metres to 142 square metres; reduce the minimum building setback from the west side lot line from 6 metres to 4.9 metres; reduce the minimum building setback from a rear lot line from 18 metres to 12.5; increase the maximum number of storeys from 3 to 4; increase maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas from 25% to 34%; and reduce the distance between a motor vehicle parking space or driveway to a window of a habitable room in an apartment dwelling from 6 metres to 2.9 metres to facilitate the construction of a new four-storey, 19-unit residential building.

The staff report noted that the requested variances for the reduction to the minimum building setback from the west side lot line and to the maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas were incorrectly identified in the Notice but were correctly identified on the site plan provided with the application. The requests are amended to a reduction to the minimum building setback from the west side lot line from 6 metres to 4.5 metres and an increase to the maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas from 25% to 37.4%.

Neil Campbell attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- The subject property is located on double lot on the north side of Lansdowne Street East, a high-capacity arterial road.
- The depth of the lot will be reduced by 8 metres by a road widening along Lansdowne Street, which is a reduction of approximately 3,875 square feet of lot area.
- The requirement of the road widening was identified in the initial meeting with the Planning Division, and the proposal was revised to reflect the new lot dimensions. A pre-consultation meeting was held to review the Site Plan proposal prior to the Minor Variance application being heard.
- They are seeking seven minor variances. Mr. Campbell noted that the requested increase to the number of dwelling units is identified in the Notice as an increase from 16 to 19, however a minor variance was granted by File Number A09/12 to allow an increase to 18 units. He further noted that the lot coverage by parking areas was noted incorrectly in the list of requested variances, with the lot coverage by parking areas being 40.3% after the road widening is taken.

- The increase to parking lot coverage is partially due to the project providing more parking spaces than required by the Zoning By-law, with 1.89 spaces per unit being proposed to be provided.
- The project addresses the Provincial Policy Statement and Official Plan policies with respect to intensification, and Lansdowne Street is a natural intensification corridor.
- The building has a unit mix of five one-bedroom units, 12 two-bedroom units and two three-bedroom units. There is a market shortage of large apartment units, and the two- and three-bedroom units have been sized to address that shortage. Three units will be barrier free, four units will have balconies, and two units on the upper floor will have rooftop terraces.
- Building features include rooftop terraces that allow for a stepped back top storey to reduce the impact of the overall massing, a common room on the ground floor facing Lansdowne Street, interior and exterior bicycle storage, and storage lockers in the basement. The building is oriented north/south with the façade facing Lansdowne. The parking lot to the east is tree lined with garbage and storage to the rear.
- The building is designed with a mix of materials and a contemporary aesthetic.
- He has received and reviewed the Staff Report.

The Chair acknowledged that the Committee has received and reviewed letters in objection to the application from the following:

- Karen Mooney, Peterborough
- Pat Maitland, Peterborough
- Tom Long, Peterborough
- Madison O'Dette, Peterborough
- D. M. Paterson, Stoney Lake Holdings Inc., Peterborough

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planner, Policy and Research advised as follows:

- The two-metre sidewalk width shown on the site plan is the distance between the end of the parking space and an awning. The distance to the building is the full 2.9 metres requested in the application.
- The location and screening of the transformer identified on the site plan would be finalized through the Site Plan approval.

- When the application was initially reviewed, staff reviewed the details of the north facing units that overlook the adjacent properties on Princess Street. The applicant introduced design solutions to reduce the impact on privacy. The upper terrace area is limited to one terrace overlooking the properties to the rear with an interior focused space. The building is located on the site as close as possible to Lansdowne Street to support the public realm and reduce the amount of parking in the front of the building. As the application moves forward, fencing and landscaping details will be finalized in the Site Plan approval process.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Applicant advised as follows:

- The horizontal distance from the parking area to the window in the two-bedroom unit at the rear of the building is 2.9 metres. The majority of the rooms on the ground floor facing the parking area are common areas, storage, and service areas.
- He believes that the transformer identified on the site plan would be owned by the developer.
- It has not yet been determined if the development will be a condominium or a rental building.
- The common room on the ground floor will be made as large as possible. The room creates a buffer from Lansdowne Street for the ground floor units and introduces more glass at the street facing elevation, which improves the visual appearance from Lansdowne Street.
- Underground parking was not contemplated for this development. For a development of this size, once the ramps are in place, there is limited space remaining to establish parking spaces, and the cost is prohibitive for the number of units proposed.
- There will be high-quality fencing and landscaped buffers along the westerly property line to reduce the impact of the reduced setback. The details would be finalized during the Site Plan review.
- There will be a curb stop between the sidewalk and the parking spaces to prevent vehicle overhang into the pedestrian area.
- Through discussions with Staff, the location of the building was adjusted to be close to the street with a prominent street presence. A 12.5 metre rear yard setback was felt to be appropriate with the impact mitigated by fencing and planting to create as much privacy as possible. Any building over two storeys will have an overlook issue, which is a condition resulting from intensification.
- There is lighting available that can detect vehicle movement and remain dimmed until movement is detected, and the applicant could incorporate that type of lighting into the development. The canopy incorporated on the ground floor is both for aesthetics and to provide downlighting that does not shine upwards.

- He has not discussed the inclusion of electric vehicle charging stations with the property owner. However, he does discuss charging stations with each of his clients. At a minimum he will recommend to his client that a string of electric vehicle chargers be roughed in, as he expects the building's tenants to have electric cars.
- Since the site plan does depict two more parking spaces than required by the Zoning By-law regulations, spaces 15 and 16 shown on the site plan could potentially be converted to landscaped space as the project moves through the site plan process. He tries not to design to a minimum standard, which does leave some flexibility to amend the plan later in the process if required.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Zoning Administrator advised as follows:

- A transformer would not require a Building Permit and would not be considered a structure.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Secretary-Treasurer advised as follows:

- Madison O'Dette did not specify their street address in their correspondence to the Committee, and the address cannot be verified using ownership records.

Pat Maitland and Ian Burns, Peterborough, ON addressed the Committee in opposition to the application, and expressed concerns to the increase to the number of storeys, increased noise from the parking area, and the lack of landscaped open space.

Discussion

Mauro DiCarlo indicated that the properties on Princess Street are located in close proximity to a busy arterial road, which is already a noisy environment. He further indicated that although the addition of a fourth floor is unusual along this area of Lansdowne Street, the addition of one additional floor is the minimum request that can be requested to that regulation, and he considers that request to be minor. To date, the subject lands have been underutilized, with large, undeveloped rear yards, and the adjacent owners enjoying the benefit of the large rear yards for a number of years. He believes that the proposed development does a good job of mitigating the impacts of the development that cannot be eliminated altogether.

With respect to the landscaping of the side yard, privacy fencing and lighting, these matters are subject to the site plan approval process, which allows for only limited public participation. If the application is approved, high quality screen fencing should be provided along the westerly property line, as well as along the rear yard, of an acoustic nature where adjacent to the parking area. The lighting at the rear should be dark sky, down-lit lighting, with lower lighting standards where appropriate to reduce the filtration of light into the adjacent rear yards.

Moved by Robert Short

That the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report, with an amendment to the proposed conditions requiring that the Site Plan agreement address the installation of a decorative, landscaped, screen fence along the westerly property line to the rear lot line, and where necessary along the rear lot line, with acoustic fencing where adjacent to the parking area and dark sky, downward lighting for the parking area to reduce the light entering the rear yards of adjacent properties.

“CARRIED”

Decision

The Committee heard from members of the public concerning the application and gave due consideration and weight to the comments made and received.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented both in the Staff Report and presentation, the Committee determined that the application should be approved as per the Staff Recommendation, as amended to require the Site Plan agreement to address lighting and fencing requirements that will reduce the impact of the development on the neighbouring properties. The Committee determined that the variances are minor, the proposal is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are maintained.

Therefore, variances are granted as follows:

- a) **A variance to Section 10.2(a) to increase the maximum number of dwelling units per building to 19;**
- b) **A variance to Section 10.2(c) to reduce the minimum lot area per dwelling unit to 142 square metres;**
- c) **A variance to Section 10.2(f)(i) to reduce the minimum building setback from the west side lot line to 4.5 metres;**
- d) **A variance to Section 10.2(f)(ii) to reduce the minimum building setback from a rear lot line to 12.5;**
- e) **A variance to Section 10.2(h) to increase the maximum number of storeys to 4;**
- f) **A variance to Section 10.2(j) increase maximum lot coverage by open parking areas, driveways and vehicle movement areas 37.4%; and**
- g) **A variance to Section 4.3.2(c) to reduce the distance between a motor vehicle parking space or driveway to a window of a habitable room in an apartment dwelling to 2.9 metres.**

PROVIDED THAT construction related to this approval proceed substantially in accordance with the concept plan attached as Exhibit D to the Staff Report dated May 25, 2022 and CONDITIONAL UPON THE FOLLOWING:

- i) The owner entering into a Site Plan Agreement, including the following requirements:**
 - a. The installation of a decorative, landscaped, screen fence along the westerly property line to the rear lot line, and where necessary along the rear lot line, with acoustic fencing where adjacent to the parking area; and**
 - b. The use of dark sky, downward lighting in the parking area, to reduce light entering the rear yards of adjacent properties; and**
- ii) Payment of any applicable parks levy, as determined by the Parks Levy Review Committee.**

4. File No., A18/22, 579 Homewood Avenue

This matter relates to a minor variance application submitted by Andrew Loeb and Carolyn Loeb the owners of the property that is the subject of the application.

The purpose of the application is to reduce the minimum building setback from the west side lot line from 1.2 metres to 0.19 metres to facilitate the construction of a second storey addition on top of the existing addition at the rear of the dwelling.

Andrew Loeb and Carolyn Loeb attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- They are seeking the variance to continue the existing setback from the west side lot line for a building addition.

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

No one spoke in objection to the application and no written objections were received.

Moved by Robert Short

That the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report.

“CARRIED”

Decision

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be approved as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variance is minor, the proposal is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are maintained.

Therefore, a variance is granted to Section 7.2.(e)(i) of the Zoning By-law to reduce the minimum building setback from the west side lot line to 0.19 metres PROVIDED THAT construction related to the approval proceed substantially in accordance with the concept plan attached as Exhibit F to the Staff Report dated May 25, 2022 and CONDITIONAL UPON submission of a lot grading and drainage plan to the satisfaction of Development Engineering.

5. File No., A19/22, 894 St. Mary's Street

This matter relates to a minor variance application submitted by Steve Ritchie, Steve Ritchie Custom Decks, as applicant on behalf of John Lawler and Carolyn Lawler, the owners of the property that is the subject of the application.

The purpose of the application is to reduce the minimum building setback from the street line from 6 metres to 4.2 metres to facilitate the construction of a roof over the existing deck at the front of the dwelling.

Steve Ritchie attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- He has reviewed the staff report and has no additional information for the Committee at this time.

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

No one spoke in objection to the application and no written objections were received.

Moved by Mauro DiCarlo

That the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report.

"CARRIED"

Decision

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented in the Staff Report, the Committee determined that the application should be approved as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variance is minor, the proposal is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are maintained.

Therefore, a variance is granted to Section 6.11(a) of the Zoning By-law to reduce the minimum building setback from a street line of a local street 20 metres or wider in width to 4.2 metres PROVIDED THAT construction of the deck related to the approval proceed substantially in accordance with the concept sketch attached as Exhibit G to the Staff Report dated May 25, 2022.

6. File No., A20/22, 156 Maria Street

This matter relates to a minor variance application submitted by Paul Blacquier and Maria Blacquier, the owners of the property that is the subject of the application.

The purpose of the application is to reduce the minimum building setback from the centreline of the street from 19 metres to 17.62 metres for a second storey addition; reduce the minimum building setback from the rear lot line from 7.6 metres to 1.1 metres for a new, two-storey addition at the rear of the existing dwelling; and increase the extension of a platform into a building setback from a rear lot line from 3 metres to 5.6 metres (having the effect of being 2 metres from the rear lot line) for stairs and landing at the rear of the proposed addition.

Maria Blacquier and Paul Blacquier attended the meeting and addressed the Committee as follows:

- Due to the configuration of the property lines on the irregular lot, minor variances are required to construct an addition to the house. The proposal is to construct a second storey and rear addition that will allow them to move the bedrooms located in the basement to the second storey.
- The first variance is to the setback from the centreline of Maria Street. The second storey addition will be stepped back from the existing main floor in line with the existing roof peak, but still does not meet the required setback in the Zoning By-law and a variance is required.
- The second variance is required for the 14 foot deep addition at the rear of the house that will contain a sitting room on the main floor and more functional space in the second storey. Because of the placement of the interior staircase, if the

rear addition was built within the setbacks, the space would not be functional. Because the easterly property line is irregular, the portion of the lot that angles in is considered a rear lot line and they require a variance from the larger rear lot line requirement.

- They need to construct a landing at the rear door due to the slope of the grade at the rear of the house. Any placement of the landing would have triggered the requirement for the third variance due to the property line that is considered a rear lot line.
- They are installing a separate entrance for the basement to allow for the flexibility to add a second unit in the basement in the future.

Christie Gilbertson, Planner, Policy and Research, advised that she had nothing further to add to the information presented in the Staff Report.

No one spoke in objection to the application and no written objections were received.

In response to questions from the Committee, Staff advised as follows:

- The rear portion of the addition is not being built over the existing structure and will involve some excavation of previously undisturbed areas. With respect to the Heritage Preservation Office requesting an Archaeological Assessment, the property does fall within an area of high potential for its proximity to a known site of interest.
- It would be reasonable for the Committee to limit the scope of the Archaeological Assessment to the area where the excavation for the rear addition is proposed to be located.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicants advised as follows:

- There is currently a deck where the rear addition would be established.

Discussion

Robert Short indicated that the requirement for the owners to complete a Stage 1 and potentially a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment should not be required for the balance of the property that will remain undisturbed.

Stewart Hamilton indicated that the requirement for the Archaeological Assessment should be limited to the portion of the property where new excavation is required.

Moved by Claude Dufresne

That the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation in the Staff Report, and that the completion of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and, if recommended, completion of a Stage 2 Assessment, is limited to the area where new excavation will occur.

“CARRIED”

Decision

The Committee received no comment or presentation from members of the public concerning the application and thus made its decision on the basis of the Staff Report and the application.

Having reviewed the application and considered the information presented both in the Staff Report and presentation, the Committee determined that the application should be approved as per the Staff Recommendation and that the variances are minor, the proposal is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, and the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan are maintained.

Therefore, variances are granted as follows:

- a) **A variance to Section 6.9 to reduce the minimum building setback from the centreline of a collector street to 17.62 metres for a second storey addition;**
- b) **A variance to Section 7.2(e)(ii) to reduce the minimum building setback from a rear lot line to 1.1 metres for a new, two-storey addition at the rear of the existing dwelling; and**
- c) **A variance to 6.19(b) to increase the extension of a platform into a building setback from a rear lot line to 5.6 metres for a landing and stairs at the rear of the proposed addition.**

PROVIDED THAT construction related to the approval proceed substantially in accordance with the concept plan attached as Exhibit H to the Staff Report dated May 25, 2022 and CONDITIONAL UPON THE FOLLOWING:

- i) **Submission of a lot grading and drainage plan to the satisfaction of Development Engineering; and**
- ii) **The completion of a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and, if recommended, completion of a Stage 2 Assessment for the area of the property where excavation will occur for the building addition. The recommendations of the Archaeological Assessment shall be addressed, and any necessary agreements shall be in place, prior to the issuance of a building permit.**

Minutes

Moved by Tom Green

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment hearing held on April 26, 2022 be approved.

“CARRIED”

Other Business

There were no items of other business.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee of Adjustment is scheduled for Tuesday, June 21, 2022.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

(Sgd.) Stewart Hamilton, Chair

(Sgd.) Jennifer Sawatzky, Secretary-Treasurer