

**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
APRIL 22nd, 2010**

Present: Roy Perry, Chair
Lee Redmayne, Member
Joan Truax, Member

Also Present: Liz Linton for Secretary-Treasurer, Administrative Assistant, Planning and Development Department

Roy Perry, Chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and explained the meeting process and the time frame for appeals to those persons present. He advised that all statements and evidence given before the Committee are of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

MINUTES:

The Minutes of March 25, 2010 were accepted by the Committee.

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST:

There were no disclosures of interest.

APPLICATIONS:

**A2/10 MICHAEL
6964 9TH Line**

Ashley Michael, owner, attended the meeting. The Planning Report was read by Liz Linton. Roy Perry asked the applicant what the purpose of the addition was. She replied that they both have a vehicle and that her husband likes to work on cars and for father's tractor and a boat.

Audience member, Diane Beckett neighbour across the road, stated husband and I are in support of the application.

Questions from committee? Lee Redmayne: existing building is over allowance are you sure you need that much space? Ashley Michael: yes. We didn't build it and when we bought the property we didn't know it was oversized already. Lee: What's in it already? Ashley Michael: cars - we each have a car plus two as hobbies. Lee: so four

The Committee Members then approved the minor variance for relief of side and rear yard setbacks.

A4/10

**GORDON
1 Trillium Lane**

Peter Gordon attended the meeting. The Planning Report was read by Liz Linton. Roy: how far is that back in? Peter Gordon: County Road 56 to our house? Lee: no your laneway is rather long. Peter Gordon: About 900 foot lane and less than 1 km maybe .8 from County Road 56. Mike Poitras commented from the audience: about 1 km. Lee : It looks like the corner of the house was never set back sufficient in the first place. Peter Gordon house built in 1993 – house built before the bylaw restriction was in place. Lee: Since you're getting a minor variance now we ought to include the actual existing building so the set back is sufficient to meet the requirements of today. It's 30 meters and we're reducing it from 100 feet to approximately 60 but if you actually mark this down there's no way its 40 feet from the proposed addition to the corner of the existing house that's not in our bylaws and guidelines at the moment, they don't meet this. Seems to me you've got really good wooded coverage right to the back of your house – does it open up after that to the river? Peter Gordon: no it's wooded from top of bank to river. Lee: I don't have problem but think the setback of existing house should be included in the minor variance so there's not a problem in future. Peter Gordon: I haven't done a final design of the addition. I think the issue at that corner of the house is the addition to top of bank, I believe the request was for 58 feet, albeit final design has not been done but will not exceed that 58'. Lee: No problem – the deal here is that's maximum so you could tilt slightly if adding on more square footing than what's shown here – so if you want to extend instead of parallel line to the house you could tilt it slightly so that you're always within that 58 feet. Peter Gordon: The top of bank, actually the contour of it, is probably from the northwest corner of the house if you were to measure directly out, there would probably be at least 200 feet and it contours down in around and back out. Lee: [referencing the site map attached to the application] so when you do this, take the shortest point, I can see right here it could be more than sufficient but then doing site lines you go to the shortest point to the bank. This is a reaction to Hurricane Hazel where people were building in flood plains and that's just dangerous.

Any audience questions: Mike Poitras: I support Peter's application. I'm at 2 Trillium Lane.

All Committee members in favour of a decision to include the existing house and addition.

Mike Poitras. does it include the garage too? Peter Gordon: The garage was built in 2007 and had NVCA approval for that. Lee: I don't think it's necessary because the garage is set further back and no matter how you do it, it's further away from the house

or addition no matter what the shortest line is. It's not necessary. Not a problem with NVCA we won't bother about it right now.

The applicant had nothing to add. There were no further comments from the audience. No other comments were heard and the Committee then voted on the application.

The Committee Members then approved the application for Minor Variance for relief from the Township's Zoning By-law setback requirement of 30m (98.4 ft) from a watercourse to 17.67 m (58') to permit a proposed addition to the southwest corner of the existing residence, and, to include the existing dwelling in this approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

No other business was heard.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Roy Perry, Chair

Liz Linton, for Secretary-Treasurer