



**Proposal:**

- É The approximately 1,983 square metres (0.49 acre) property is currently occupied by a dwelling with attached decking, one garden shed type accessory structure and a second accessory structure currently under construction.
- É The following variance is requested in order to facilitate the construction of the new marine storage facility:
  1. A variance to permit a front yard setback of 14.5 metres (48.5 feet) for a marine storage facility whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum front yard setback of 15 metres (50 feet).
  2. A variance to permit a side yard setback of 0.9 metres (2.9 feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a setback of 4.5 metres (14.7 feet) is from the side lot line for a marine storage facility.

**Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Correspondence:**

None

**Staff Report D16-045:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the applicant was present and stated that he had nothing to add.*

*The Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any comments on this application, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.*

*The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows: None.*

*The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The applicant was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The applicant confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.*

**DECISION – APPROVE  
Variance Application A-27-16 (Bettencourt)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variance to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. A variance to permit a front yard setback of 14.5 metres (48.5 feet) for a marine storage facility whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum front yard setback of 15 metres (50 feet).
2. A variance to permit a side yard setback of 0.9 metres (2.9 feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a setback of 4.5 metres (14.7 feet) is from

the side lot line for a marine storage facility.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible.
3. That the building only be used as a marine storage facility as defined under Zoning By-law 2010-65 as: ~~%An~~ accessory building for the storage of boat supplies and marine accessories.+
4. That the marine storage facility does not contain habitable space. Habitable is defined under Zoning By-law 2010-65 as: ~~%An~~ enclosed space improved or conditioned for human comfort, and includes areas designed for living, sleeping, eating or food preparation.+
5. A building permit be obtained from the Township for the construction of the marine storage facility with attached unenclosed decking.
6. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans submitted with the Application.

EFFECT of written and oral submissions on the decision:

THE REASONS for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

AND the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

<b>2. Variance Application No.:</b>	<b>A-28-16</b>
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Sean &amp; Lexi Deece-Cassidy</b>
<b>Roll Number:</b>	<b>4351 010 009 36590 0000</b>
<b>Municipal Address:</b>	<b>2998 Pinecone Trail</b>

*The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application and outlined the correspondence received, as follows:*

**Proposal:**

- É The approximately 6,475.2 square metres (1.6 acre) property supports an existing single detached dwelling with an attached deck.
- É The following variance is requested:
  1. The applicant has requested a front yard setback of 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) for a detached accessory structure whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended,

establishes a minimum front yard setback of 15 metres (50 feet) for an accessory structure within the Estate Residential (ER) Zone.

**Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Correspondence:**

None

**Staff Report D16-046:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the applicant was present and stated that he plans to replant vegetation after construction.*

*The Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any comments on this application, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.*

*The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows:*

- É The Chair made reference to agenda item G1, a letter regarding the consideration of fees and gave the applicant a chance to speak to the item.*
- É The applicant stated that he came in person to ask for the front yard setback and was told 7.5 metres; he had the information written down.*
- É Member Vandergeest expressed his support for the application and stated that regardless of when the issue was caught now or if the property changed hands, the minor variance would have still been required.*
- É Member Vivian agreed with Member Vandergeest.*
- É The applicant stated that they would not have needed the minor variance if the information was obtained originally they would have designed the building differently if they knew about the 50 foot setback.*
- É The Chair stated that he did not support the reduction of fees and that the other Committee members seemed to agree.*
- É Committee members expressed their lack of support for the reduction in fees.*

*The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The applicant was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The applicant confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.*

**DECISION – APPROVE**  
**Variance Application A-28-16 (Deece-Cassidy)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variance to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. The applicant has requested a front yard setback of 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) for a detached accessory structure whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum front yard setback of 15 metres (50 feet) for an accessory structure within the Estate Residential (ER) Zone.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible, particularly to buffer the front and interior property line close to the proposed structure.
3. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans and drawings submitted with the Application.

**EFFECT** of written and oral submissions on the decision:

**THE REASONS** for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

**AND** the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>3. Minor Variance Application No.:</b> | <b>A-29-16</b>                 |
| <b>Owner:</b>                             | <b>Murray Locke</b>            |
| <b>Roll Number:</b>                       | <b>4351 010 004 02210 0000</b> |
| <b>Municipal Address:</b>                 | <b>1964 Lloyd Circle</b>       |

*The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application(s) and the correspondence received, as follows:*

**Proposal:**

- É The 2.48 hectare (6.15 acres) property is currently occupied by a single detached dwelling, attached garage, septic and well.
- É The applicant would like to construct a new 148.6 square metres (1600 square feet) accessory structure for the storage of a recreational vehicle (RV).
- É The following variance is requested in order to permit the construction of the new accessory structure:
  1. A variance to permit an accessory structure height of 5.5 metres (18 feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65 states the maximum permitted height for an accessory structure is 5 metres (16.4 feet).
  2. A variance to permit an accessory structure size of 148.6 square metres (1,600

square feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65 states the maximum accessory structure size is the lesser of 110 square metres or 75% of the gross floor area of the principle dwelling.

**Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Correspondence:**

None

**Staff Report D16-047:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the property owner was present and stated that he has a dump trailer and an enclosed trailer, in addition to the RV that he would like to keep inside the new garage.*

*The Chair asked if there were any comments from anyone in the audience, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.*

*The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows:*

- É Member Vandergeest expressed his support for the application and that a similar height application had previously come before the Committee within the same area.*

*The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The property owner was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The property owner confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.*

**DECISION – APPROVE  
Variance Application A-29-16 (Locke)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variances to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. A variance to permit an accessory structure height of 5.5 metres (18 feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65 states the maximum permitted height for an accessory structure is 5 metres (16.4 feet).
2. A variance to permit an accessory structure size of 148.6 square metres (1,600 square feet) whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65 states the maximum accessory structure size is the lesser of 110 square metres or 75% of the gross floor area of the principle dwelling.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible.
3. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans and drawings submitted with the Application.

**EFFECT** of written and oral submissions on the decision:

THE REASONS for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

AND the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

<b>4. Variance Application No.:</b>	<b>A-30-16</b>
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Helmar &amp; Siegmur Pischkitl</b>
<b>Roll Number:</b>	<b>4351 050 004 08900 0000</b>
<b>Municipal Address:</b>	<b>4134 Graham Road</b>

*The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application(s) and outlined the correspondence received, as follows:*

***Proposal:***

- É The 7,284 square metres (1.8 acre) property is currently occupied by a dwelling, privy and a recently constructed dock and unenclosed deck with a gazebo type structure.
- É The applicants have requested the following minor variances:
  1. An unenclosed deck measuring 48.1 square metres whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended limits the floor area to 30.0 square metres.
  2. A maximum cumulative width of 18.28 metres for a dock whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended limits the width of shoreline structures to 25% of the lot frontage to a maximum of 15.0 metres.
  3. A dock envelope of 18.28 metres by 6 metres whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended states that docks must fit within a 8.0 metre by 10.0 metre rectangular area or envelope adjacent to the shore.
  4. A front yard setback of negative 2.4 metres for a gazebo whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended establishes a minimum setback of 4.0 metres from the shoreline.

**Agency Comments:**

None

### **Public Correspondence:**

A document book containing a report and pictures was submitted to staff and the Committee by Heather Bird and Glen Grunwald, 1038 The Spur, in opposition to the application.

A written comment was submitted from Doug Roberts on behalf of the Tea Lake Cottagers Association, in opposition to the application.

### **Staff Report D16-049:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the applicant was present and stated that it was built bigger as two people in the family are disabled and with the car parked back 400 feet and the unusual topography they pick people up from the head of the lake and bring them directly to the dock by boat rather than having everyone navigate the terrain. The applicant further stated that the deck is large enough for everyone and that the gazebo does not go well anywhere else.*

*The Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any comments on this application. Oral submissions were as follows:*

- É Lynn Walker, 1032 The Spur, stated that her property was within the 60 metres and that the dock and deck application is one structure and unlike any other on the lake. She believes there is a negative impact on the shoreline and that the Gazebo has a barbeque, furniture and four walls.*
- É Ms. Walker further stated that she was not in support of the application.*
- É Heather Bird, 1038 The Spur, stated that she is the nearest neighbour and has given a report outlining her concerns to the Committee and staff.*
- É Ms. Bird expressed her desire to provide some additional comments and stated that she was the secretary of the lake association and therefore had excused herself from this role in the association pertaining to this property.*
- É Ms. Bird further commented that this had been a tough summer being at odds with their nearest neighbours while construction occurred all summer.*
- É Ms. Bird explained how she did not feel that the size of the dock and gazebo were minor and that nothing on the lake was like it, stating there were examples within the report submitted and providing a brief summary of her submission.*
- É Doug Roberts, 4388 Graham Road, representing the Tea Lake Cottagers Association stated that part of the association's mandate is to work with the Township to enforce the Zoning By-law.*
- É Mr. Roberts provided comments in opposition to the application, a written copy was submitted.*
- É Glen Grunwald, 1038 The Spur, expressed his opposition to all of the variances.*
- É Mr. Grunwald stated that he believed bad behaviour was being rewarded by considering the application and stated that if this were allowed to happen other people would beg for forgiveness.*
- É The Chair gave the applicant a chance to respond to the comments received.*
- É The applicant stated that this was the first renovation in 20 years and that theirs was one of the smallest cottages on the lake, very modest, whereas most are worth ½ a*



*million on the lake and that he has done work on Fridays to not disturb people on the weekend.*

- É The applicant addressed the Gazebo comments stating that the structure is brown so that it can hardly be seen from the lake, not an eye sore that sticks out and that it does not have walls, only mosquito nets.*
- É The applicant further stated that they are not polluting and discussed wildlife present around the shore of the property, stating they had been there since the 1960s and do not believe the environment has been impacted.*
- É Mel Nolte, brother-in-law to the applicant, 4134 Graham Road, stated that he had multiple discussions with Jim Oakley (Township Chief Building Official) about making it safe to walk on and filled out all the applications, they did not ignore the Township.*
- É The applicant also provided comments regarding the diving board, stating that it is located on a rock, not attached to the dock.*

*The Chair asked if anyone else in the audience had any comments on this application, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.*

*The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. The Committee comments were as follows:*

- É Member Vivian inquired to staff about the ability to consider the gazebo minor variance.*
- É The Planner read Section 3.2.12.7 of Zoning By-law 2010-65 and explained to the Committee that as there is a prohibition on gazebos on docks, therefore the current location is not eligible for a minor variance.*
- É Member Vandergeest inquired when the construction began.*
- É The applicant stated that they received the stop work on June 2 and then began the application process then.*
- É Member Vandergeest stated that he dislikes these types of applications where the structure is already completed prior to coming before the Committee or obtaining a permit.*
- É Member Silk expressed her support for an adjournment of the application to give the applicant a chance to adjust the size and still have a useable dock.*
- É Member Hamilton stated that he supported Member Silk's comments.*
- É The Chair stated that he did not support the current application; that the Township has by-laws and he does not appreciate the construction prior to approvals.*
- É Member Vandergeest inquired about the timing of removing the Gazebo going forward.*
- É The Planner stated that any removal a structure would be supervised by the Building Department and the timing would be something they would regulate.*
- É Member Vivian inquired how frontage is measured.*
- É The Planner explained how frontage on a water front property is measured in accordance with the Township's Zoning By-law 2010-65.*
- É Member Vivian expressed his support to defer the matter so the applicants could propose a solution that fits.*
- É Member Vandergeest stated that he supported a deferral to allow for modifications of the applications.*

The following motion was adopted:

Motion # 16-25

MOVED by Mark Vandergeest and SECONDED by Allen Vivian

THAT Application No. A-30-16 be adjourned to a future Committee of Adjustment meeting a revised proposal for the minor variance requested, excluding the minor variance for the location of the gazebo. Also notice is to be reissued for the application so the public can issue further comments.

CARRIED

<b>5. Minor Variance Application No.:</b>	<b>A-31-16</b>
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Earle &amp; Michelle Graham</b>
<b>Roll Number:</b>	<b>4351 050 003 86400 0000</b>
<b>Municipal Address:</b>	<b>3290 Seydel Lane</b>

The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application(s) and the correspondence received, as follows:

**Proposal:**

- É The approximately 6,268.3 (1.5 acres) property is occupied by an existing single detached dwelling, septic, two boat ports and three accessory buildings.
- É The existing dwelling is a unique situation where a portion of the existing dwelling is built over the water, supported by cribs similar to a boathouse with the remainder of the dwelling located on shore.
- É The following variances are requested:
  1. A variance to permit a minimum front yard setback of 0 metres to the main dwelling wall, whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum front yard setback of 20 metres (66 ft.) for the Shoreline Residential Three (SR3) Zone.

**Agency Comments:**

A letter of correspondence dated September 15, 2016 was received from the Trent Severn Waterway which stated that the agency would be supportive of the removal of the existing structure over the bed of the lake and that any works would require review by the Trent Severn Waterway.

**Public Correspondence:**

A letter of correspondence dated September 18, 2016 was received from Leo and Carol Seydel, 3298 and 3291 Seydel Lane stating that they had no objection to their neighbours plans to expand and renovate.

**Staff Report D16-048:**

The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.

The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the property owner was present and stated that it was his builder's recommendation to remove the front section that overhands the water and that the portion

on the shore was stable.

The Chair asked if there were any comments from anyone in the audience, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.

The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows:

- É Member Vivian inquired if a decision should be made prior to an approval from Trent Severn Waterway.
- É The planner advised the Committee that regardless of this Committee's decision, a permit or approval from Trent Severn Waterway would still be needed and that the property owners were well aware of the process.
- É Member Silk stated that she would typically not be in favour of a zero metre setback, however that this was a unique situation.
- É Member Silk further stated that the property owners should do what they can to push back any new building.
- É The Chair expressed his agreement with Member Silk.
- É Member Hamilton inquired about the Trent Severn Waterway's jurisdiction over land.
- É The Planner advised that the Trent Severn governs the shoreline in addition to in water works.

The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The property owner was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The property owner confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.

**DECISION – APPROVE**  
**Variance Application A-31-16 (Graham)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variances to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. A variance to permit a minimum front yard setback of 0 metres to the main dwelling wall, whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum front yard setback of 20 metres (66 ft.) for the Shoreline Residential Three (SR3) Zone.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible, particularly within the first 60 m from the shore.
3. That the applicant obtain the necessary permissions and approvals from the Trent Severn Waterway pertaining to the removal of the portion of the dwelling over the

- water and construction of the additions with a 0 metre setback from the water.
4. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans and drawings submitted with the Application.

EFFECT of written and oral submissions on the decision:

THE REASONS for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

AND the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

<b>6. Minor Variance Application No.:</b>	<b>A-32-16</b>
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>John &amp; Eric Rydzkowski</b>
<b>Roll Number:</b>	<b>4351 050 003 46500 0000</b>
<b>Municipal Address:</b>	<b>1968 South Riverside Drive</b>

*The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application(s) and the correspondence received, as follows:*

***Proposal:***

- É The applicant would like to expand and renovate an existing non-conforming dwelling on the property.
- É The dwelling is non-conforming as only one dwelling per lot is a permitted use in the SR3 zone and this property has two. Both dwellings pre-date any zoning controls on the land and are considered to be legally established.
- É The applicant has requested an expansion of approximately 650 square feet to accommodate living space, a screened porch and decking (Appendix 2).
- É Section 3.20.4 of Zoning By-law 2010-65 states that a non-conforming building may not be expanded without an approval through the Planning Act.
- É Additions to legal non-conforming uses are typically addressed through the minor variance process.

**Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Correspondence:**

None

**Staff Report D16-050:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented and had nothing to add.*

The Chair asked if there were any comments from anyone in the audience, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.

The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows: None.

The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The property owner was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The property owner confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.

**DECISION – APPROVE**  
**Variance Application A-33-16 (Rydzkowski)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variances to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. A minor variance to permit an expansion of approximately 650 square feet to accommodate living space, a screened porch and decking, whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, states that a non-conforming building may not be expanded without an approval through the Planning Act.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible.
3. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans and drawings submitted with the Application.

**EFFECT** of written and oral submissions on the decision:

**THE REASONS** for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

**AND** the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

**7. Minor Variance Application No.:**  
**Owner:**

**A-33-16**  
**Robert Torella**

**Applicant:**  
**Roll Number:**  
**Municipal Address:**

**Josh Morgan, Morgan Planning**  
**4351 010 006 22500 0000**  
**3917 Menoke Beach Road**

*The Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment outlined the application(s) and the correspondence received, as follows:*

***Proposal:***

- É The approximately 1,140 square metres (0.28 acre) property is occupied by an existing single storey detached dwelling and two small accessory structures. The following variances were originally applied for in order to permit the construction of the new accessory building and addition to the main dwelling:
1. A maximum height of 5.5 metres for an accessory building whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended establishes a maximum height of 5 metres.
  2. A maximum accessory structure lot coverage of 8% whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended limits the lot coverage of accessory structures to 5%.
  3. A maximum lot coverage of 28% whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended establishes a maximum lot coverage of 15% within the first 60 metres of the shoreline.
  4. An interior yard setback of 2.7 metres whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum interior yard setback of 3 metres for the Shoreline Residential Two (SR2) Zone.

**Agency Comments:**

None

**Public Correspondence:**

None

**Staff Report D16-051:**

*The Planner provided a brief summary of the staff report.*

*The Chair asked if the applicant or agent were present and had anything to add to what was presented - the property owner was present and stated that he had a great experience working with the staff at the Township, had already removed the sheds and got the septic permit.*

*The Chair asked if there were any comments from anyone in the audience, since none were forthcoming, the Chair declared the public portion of the meeting closed.*

*The Chair asked if the Committee had any comments on this application. Committee comments were as follows: None.*

*The Chair asked the Secretary-Treasurer to review the proposed conditions of the decision. The property owner was asked if he was aware of the proposed conditions and was in agreement with them. The property owner confirmed this. The Chair then called for a vote on the application.*

**DECISION – APPROVE**  
**Variance Application A-33-16 (Torella)**

**THE PURPOSE and EFFECT** of the application is:

The following variances to the provisions of Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended:

1. A maximum height of 5.5 metres for an accessory building whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended establishes a maximum height of 5 metres.
2. A maximum accessory structure lot coverage of 8% whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended limits the lot coverage of accessory structures to 5%.
3. A maximum lot coverage of 28% whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended establishes a maximum lot coverage of 15% within the first 60 metres of the shoreline.
4. An interior yard setback of 2.7 metres whereas Zoning By-law 2010-65, as amended, establishes a minimum interior yard setback of 3 metres for the Shoreline Residential Two (SR2) Zone.

The Committee has considered the Application and, based upon the evidence provided, issues the following Decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016:

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Municipal Taxes to be paid to date.
2. That the applicants obtain a permit for a replacement sewage disposal system.
2. That the existing vegetation on the property shall be preserved and enhanced as much as possible.
3. That the construction is in substantial compliance with the plans and drawings submitted with the Application.

**EFFECT** of written and oral submissions on the decision:

**THE REASONS** for the Committee's Decision are that the request is minor in nature, conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law and Official Plan and is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land.

**AND** the Secretary-Treasurer is hereby authorized to sign any documents required to give effect to this Decision.

**CARRIED**

**E. REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS**  
*NONE*

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

**1. A-28-16 (Deece-Cassidy) – Consideration of fees**

*The Committee members discussed this letter of correspondence in conjunction with application A-28-16.*

*The following motion was adopted:*

*Motion # 16-24*

*MOVED by Mark Vandergeest and SECONDED by Allen Vivian*

*THAT a letter of correspondence regarding the consideration of fees for A-28-16 (Deece-Cassidy) was received for information.*

*AND THAT the fees will not be reimbursed.*

**CARRIED**

**G. OTHER BUSINESS**

*NONE*

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

*The following motion was adopted:*

*Motion # 16-26*

*MOVED by Emily Silk and SECONDED by Douglas Hamilton*

*THAT the Committee of Adjustment meeting be adjourned at 8:47 p.m. on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The Committee will reconvene at 7:00 p.m. on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 unless the Secretary-Treasurer has not received a complete application for the Committee's consideration.*

**CARRIED**

---

*Katie Mandeville, Secretary-Treasurer*