



CITY OF WINDSOR

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

FOR THE HEARING OF

August 24, 2023

A hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on August 24, 2023, located , Via Electronic Participation.
The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Mike Sleiman, Chair
Dante Gatti, Vice-Chair
Joe Balsamo Member
Frank Cerasa, Member
Mohammed Baki, Member

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer

Also in attendance, Administrative staff, representing the interests of the City of Windsor were:

Simona Simion, (Planner II – Research & Policy Support) Planning Department
Pablo Golob(Planner II - Development Review) Planning Department
Zaid Zwayed (Zoning Co-ordinator) Planning Department
Sandy Mio, (Technologist I) Engineering & Geomatics Department
Clare Amicarelli (Transportation Engineer) Transportation Planning
Stefan Fediuk, (Landscape Architect), Planning Department
Greg Atkinson, (Manager /Deputy City Planner), Planning Department

* * * * *

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
and the general nature thereof

There being no disclosure of pecuniary interest at this time, the following applications were considered in the order as contained herein.

Mike Sleiman - declares conflict of interest for Items 1-3 on the Agenda - LOTS 31 & 32, CORNER ON REGISTERED PLAN 1579 and known as Municipal Number 991 MORAND ST and will remove himself for these proceedings.

Dante Gatti - declares conflit of interest on Item 12 & 13 of this agenda. - PART LOT 87 ON CONCESSION 1, PART BLOCKS G & H ON REGISTERED PLAN 315, PART 12 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-7370, PARTS 1, 2, 5 & 6 AND PART OF PART 4 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-20656. and known as Municipal Number 600-718 TECUMSEH RD E

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): FOUAD BADOOR

Subject Lands: LOTS 31 & 32, CORNER ON REGISTERED PLAN 1579 and known as Municipal Number 991 MORAND ST

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

RELIEF: The creation of 2 new Lots (Lots B & C), with reduced minimum Lot width (Lot C only) and reduced side yard widths for retained and severed Lots.

REQUEST: Conveyance of the above said lands for the purpose of creating 2 new Lots.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Fouad Badour, Owner
Claudio Silvaggi, Neighbour
Tony Sisti, Neighbour
Terri Fletcher, Neighbour
Patricia Beemer, Neighbour
Barry Henney, Neighbour
Anne-Marie Toldo, Neighbour

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair (Mike Sleiman) declares a conflict of interest in these items and the Acting Chair (Dante Gatti) presides.

The Acting Chair asks for a motion to hear all items concurrently as files **B-033/23, B-034/23 and A-048/23** - LOTS 31 & 32, CORNER ON REGISTERED PLAN 1579 and known as Municipal Number 991 MORAND ST

Move by : Joe Balsamo,

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

The Acting-Chair outlines that many objections have been received for these items, and he would like to have the spokesperson for the neighbours to come forward and address for the committee and public the objections.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Faoud confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. He proceeds to outline he is looking to create 2 new Lots (Lots B & C), with reduced minimum Lot width (Lot C only) and reduced side yard widths for retained and severed Lots.

The Acting-Chair addresses the objection letters received, and a petition from neighbours who are not in support of the proposal. Ms. Simion, gives a brief overview of the recommendation based on the changes in legislation and how they feel is not applicable, and outlines that the City administrations report is in support of the 3 applications.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Claudio Silvaggi, Tony Sisti, Anne-Marie Toldo, Steve Boudnar all come forward to represent the neighbours and provides a PowerPoint presentation to those all in attendance including committee members, administration, the applicant/owner and the public and discussion surrounding the objections. The concerns surrounding the severances and proposed dwelling in the neighbours opinion is not compatible with the current setting of the neighbourhood characteristics. The concerns are the impact it will have on the community. Please see attached objections read at the meeting as Appendix "A" *

*NOTE: This documentation was presented to Administration, prior to the hearing date and reviewed by the Committee.

*NOTE: The objections were provided to the Applicant for review prior to the Committee hearing.

The exchange of conversation amongst Mr. Boudnar outlines that they feel this severance is for an investment only, and that the variances should not be allowed. The impact is on this area as this is a residential lot, and that the zone density has changed and they feel is not prepared for it. It is outlined that this is not the 1st time this address has come forward and was rejected by the Committee of Adjustment and the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), and he is very perplexed as how this even made it to the COA agenda again. The neighbours would like an explanation of the hardship that will be addressed if approved today by the COA, and they find it intrusive to be setting a new precedent within Residential zoned properties, and feel it is eroding the streetscape and the safety within the community. They would like to understand the priority of this request. It is with the understanding of Bill 23 with legislation changes, this should not be deemed permitted and realize it is in order with such, however the city has taken actions to amend zoning for density and in August of 2023 the new measurements were introduced to this already, minimizing their property limits. The neighbours feel that with these minor variances requested with this proposal it is hard to achieve, and from a transparency perspective they would like to feel protected from future proposals if this is granted today, and that due to the city writing bylaws and enforcing them why is this particular area being abandoned. Concerns address the timing of receiving information for today's committee agenda item is brought forward. The neighbours can't understand due to lack of information what is being proposed, there are no drawings of what is going to be developed and would serve to better understand what is being proposed for the "new lots", and the significant change seems to be isolated to only showing a severance for 3 lots. There are natural hazards associated with this sort of proposed to having 3 homes with "X" amount of meters between buildings, and the concerns are the proposal isn't safe in the event of fires etc. Bill 23, is subject to interpretation, and different ways of demonstrating, and they feel this Bill 23 was introduced for removing government bureaucracy, not severances, and ask how is this criteria coming into play with this decision making before us? They feel this defies common sense and tax paying individuals who have lived over 20 + years in this area and they are dedicated to loving the neighbourhood. The neighbours are defined by the bylaws that have been in place, and would be fine of the severance in a double lot, but to propose 3 lots is a bit much and therefore they are against it.

Mr. Boudnar outlines the websites Urban Design outlined by the City, and would like to see it reinforced, he feels this proposal is causing undue influence with these types of developments, and with respect to the neighbourhood, residents choose areas based on where they want to live, and these types of decisions should not influence this area.

Tony Sisti – Neighbour – 891 Morand Street - addresses the committee "why is this public meeting being conducted via electronic participation (via Zoom platform), and not an in-person meeting", and he feels more residents would be in attendance and feels this public meeting is being handled this way, for lack of transparency. He is in support of the neighbours and outlines he would like to object to this proposal. The Chair outlines that since COVID, electronic meetings have been the preferred method, and they have been handled accordingly since 2020, and that all individuals are able to attend remotely, and the benefits it has for the public, that all materials for all meetings are on our website, and there is a variety of methods to participate in the meetings.

Terri Fletcher and Patricia Beemer- 990 Ducharme – Her property abuts the proposed Lot(s) and she feels the purchaser has left the grounds unmaintained for months already and fear the ongoing will continue moving forward. She outlines that this encroaches the beauty of the neighbourhood, and with the proposed, there won't be access to hydro wires, etc. and the lack of space for 3 homes, has no capacity for the infrastructure nor the current sewer systems, and would be over-hauling the systems for the existing home owners. She expresses they are already experiencing sewer back-ups. She outlines the lack of parking, and asks if there would be an opportunity for other neighbours to purchase lands surrounding for additional parking and expresses concerns with nearby wildlife that also would be affected and encroaches on the

heritage trees and historical preservation currently surrounding the neighbourhood in her opinion. She is not in support of this application.

Anne-Marie Toldo – 961 Morand – Ms. Toldo outlines the variances for side yard creates safety hazard, and the 3 feet limits fires hazards for all 3 properties, and in the event of an emergency or tragedy who would be held accountable? Ms. Toldo submitted a letter and a petition (See Appendix's).

Barry Henney – Neighbour – Mr. Henney outlines this proposal was denied previously by the COA and OMB and recalls a past situation with respect to a subdivision that at such time the character of such was recognized by the Planning department and was in support of having these lots to be similar in these sizes in this area, so why is this any different now. Mr. Henney, outlines that south Windsor is under a lot of new development, but this area has now become lodging homes for students, and the land owners are not taking care of these properties, and the onus is falling on neighbours to complain. He feels this proposal is no different. He cares about the look of the neighbourhood and the current residents do not find this fair – as the proposed 3 lots do not match the character sketch of the neighbourhood. He would like some consideration to his concerns and is not in support.

Mr. Silvaggi – 951 Morand, outlines a past court decision that outlines what a minor variance is and that it shouldn't be granted based on hardship and that case law is prevalent here. He proceeds to read a case based on the Act.

Ms. Simion, Planner, responds and includes there has been a comprehensive By-law 8600 previously and was approved 20 years ago, she outlines that both Lots (B & C) comply with the by-law 8600, however there is a reduced lot width due to the Lot A and current garage. She said that they are correct that the application went to the OMB and denied in 2003 as per Bylaw 3072, which is not in affect anymore and the By-law changed 20 years ago. The OMB did not allow the lot be created, and in their minutes they stated the proposal review is not based on the new bylaw 8600 as it was submitted when the previous By-law was still in effect. She outlined that together with the Bylaw 8600, and her professional opinion and review, this will not have minimal impact on the properties and the variances are desirable and will allow for promotion and creation of new infill and future development and is supported by the City of Windsor and her recommendation is to Grant the consents and the variance relief

The Chair addresses the Committee for further questions –

The Acting Chair, addresses administration - with 70 people outlining that the nature of the application is not consistent of the neighbourhood, he feels these objections are substantial, and in his strong opinion this is not in character of the neighbourhood. Mr. Gatti, asks administration for more information with respect to how it was deemed to infact be “within the characteristics of the neighbourhood?”

Ms. Simion provides response – Lot Widths for Lot A & B – is compliant, only deficiency is sideline width, and the proposed of 2.4 meters is for fire hazard that is required by the Ontario Building Code, anything less would have to provide an enhanced fire wall. Lot C – The proposed Lot width is a bit smaller and there is a garage there (this could be demolished or moved). This is the minor variance request.

In her opinion Lot B is compliant as is also A. Ms. Simion said she looked to other properties in the vicinity, and provided examples of others for reference and comparison of the proposed for her report to the Committee. Ms. Simion further explains, this Lot at 991 Morand is not just one lot – it is already 2 Lots currently, and the largest on the block, if at any time already without Committee consent, the applicant currently can a demolish and build on both lots without any approvals from COA. The 3 Lot configuration proposed is what required the minor variances, and she reviewed nearby streets with 3 homes on corner lots including 1075 Ducharme, which also received an appeal but was not granted, the 6th Concession and another Morand St address with a 3-Lot configuration. She outlined there was an appeal, and the house was built. Administration supports this proposal for these reasons.

The Acting Chair asks if Fire Department reviewed this proposal. Ms. Simion outlined that there were no comments received from fire at this time, and the application was circulated to them.

The public addresses administration in a very unpleasant manner, and is interjected by staff that this type of rude display is unnecessary, and asks for order or they will be removed from the meeting.

Mr. Henney, addresses this is where he lives, and if a site visit was warranted. The previous decision Ms. Simion spoke of with the objection a few years ago he understands, but

accountability for characteristics was not taken seriously, and if they didn't care then, he hopes it would be taking into accountability now.

Mr. Faoud, Owner, asks for a turn to discuss his side. He heard the neighbours and has asked for the recording to stop. He outlines that he is not a developer and paid a significant amount to build 3 homes and sever into 3 Lots. He outlines he pays mortgages to and he is trying to develop properly. He addresses, that he is requesting variances that are and continue to be granted daily by the COA, and it is less than 5% . Mr. Faoud outlines that Fire department allows for 4 feet separation and under, as long as a firewall separation is provided. He outlines he is creating an 8 feet minimum. He outlines for the neighbours, he can currently build already on the Lots as is, and rent them out, and he doesn't require approval for such. He said he lives in the neighbourhood as well and plans to continue. He indicates this development has been outlined, and that he is only asking for the opportunity to build these homes. The issue is only the variances here which he feels have been granted in the past, and due to emotional pain before us, the committee should not be basing their decision on emotions but on facts, and by-laws. He would like the consideration to be fair.

Mr. Cerasa, outlines that he has a sketch and labled it a "Micky-mouse sketch", and not actual site-plan or preferred scaled drawings, and it's hard for him to make an acceptable decision. He outlined that with the garage currently on Lot A it can be moved or demolished, and the side yard is 0.9 m (3 feet) could be even modified, and unfortunately with the way this is currently being proposed and presented he is not in support of it, regardless of the new guidelines. His decisions for the Minor Variances be Denied based on the separation between buildings and an encroachment may come later, and he outlines the side yards are not acceptable. The garage encroaches on Lot C and although modified, it is his main objections to not accept this. Mr. Cerasa moves the motion to dismiss the application as presented.

Mr. Balsamo outlined he visited the site, he read the objections, he outlines the proposed is not in characteristics with the neighbourhood, and he echoes Mr. Cerasa in his motion for a denial/dismissal.

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

Mr. Bakki, is in agreement to the application being denied and votes.

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE DENIED and DISMISSED** as applied for.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPENDIX "A"

Objections –
Committee of Adjustment – August 24, 2023

ITEM # 1,2, 3 - 991 Morand – Consent for 2 lots and MV

1- Leslea McMullen - neighbour

Please accept this email as a request to cease the request to sever the lot at 991 Morand Street. I am a resident in the neighbourhood and I am strongly opposed to the severance of the lot at 991 Morand. This is a mature neighbourhood with many trees and wildlife like unique birds. Construction would impact the environment and change the dynamics of our beautiful neighborhood.

Severing the lot sets a bad precedent for anyone interested in gaining for capital purposes. The owner of this house should consider doing this in a subdivision, but Roseland East. The lot sizes are unique to Roseland East in South Windsor. If it was meant to have two lots, it would have been developed like that in the first place. It would be an incredible shame to move forward with

this request. It is incredibly important to many of us in this neighbourhood to maintain the integrity of this area.

Not only am I opposed to this idea, the house has sat empty for nearly two years. Skunk infested, unkempt lawn and unopened pool (for two summers!).

2 - Bill Landry – neighbour 941 Morand

I am very opposed to this proposed property being divided into 3 individual lots. One of these proposed sites doesn't meet the minimum required frontage. I live at 941 Morand, and have lived here for over 26 years. I support Annemarie Todo's letter, along with other like-minded citizens in our neighbourhood. Decisions from Town Hall make me wonder about the people that support this type of decision making, and do so without giving sufficient prior notice to the Morand Street residents. Shame on you.

3 - Ron & Margaret Bourke – neighbour - 1065 Morand St

We strongly oppose the reduction of 991 Morand st. to three undersized lots. Changing the by-law to a neighbourhood that is well established for fifty years plus is not acceptable. This would be a radical change.

4 - Patricia Beemer, Terri Fletcher, Judy Kohler – neighbours

We'd like to introduce ourselves to you. We are Patricia Beemer 72, Terri Fletcher 60, and Judith Kohler 84. We are the residents of 990 Ducharme Street, Windsor, ON. N9G 1K9. We live directly behind 991 Morand Street. Our back yards touch each other. We heard that the city of Windsor is considering a request to sever this lot and we are opposed to that as it will negatively impact us in numerous ways.

I am writing to oppose the proposed splitting of the lot at 991 Morand street. First of all, I don't think there is room for 3 lots there and I believe it's against the bylaws. Likewise, our city sewer system is already over extended and backs up when we have heavy rains which it never used to do, but since the city has added new houses and sub-divisions all around us we have experienced water back up and damage. If you could look into cleaning out our sewer systems and maybe even overhauling them and replacing them that would be reasonable and benefit the housing units already in existence here.

Moreover, we have old growth trees on that lot and the rest of our area, and our neighborhood is over 70 plus years old and severing this lot will not only take away from the beauty, heritage, and history of our Old Roseland area (which is already invaded with urban development along the Provincial, Cabana, and extended "New Ducharme" roads), but encroaches on our rights to privacy, which we have already suffered from.

We have lived, own, and pay taxes on our home for 40 plus years and our neighborhood has already changed drastically. Especially since the city sold the lot with the empty field across from our home where our neighbor hood children played for decades and now there is a huge mansion taking its place. The traffic is dangerous, and we have already petitioned the city for traffic calming remedies, for example, speed bumps etc. Ours is a simple middle income, quaint little neighborhood and we are trying to keep it that way.

We feel that this is an irresponsible request from the buyer at 991 Morand Street who has demonstrated this irresponsibility by leaving this address abandoned since its purchase a year ago, leaving the grounds unattended and unmaintained. The grass is overgrown, trees left untrimmed and over grown onto our property and the mosquitoes are horrendous because of the standing water and overgrowth which again, is against the bylaws of our fair city of Windsor. In conclusion, we beg of you to please consider keeping our neighborhood the way it is and please do not sever this lot. We have many elder neighbors including our 95 year old next door. Our quiet way of life and beautiful natural neighborhood and our wishes should be taken into consideration and we should be informed and consulted when these major changes to our environment are being decided upon. We are adamantly opposed to the severing of the lot at 991 Morand Street on the corner of Barton Street. Please take that into consideration when you contemplate that purchaser request, as we would be so grateful to you for this consideration, thank you.

5 - Anna & Steve Bodnar – neighbours

We are writing in regards to the proposed property expansion for 991 Morand St. As long tenured home owners for 29 years we are COMPLETELY OPPOSED to this proposal of the owner adding 2 more homes on this corner property. This proposal has already been brought to the Ontario Municipal Board back in 2003 by the previous owners and it was DENIED.

This change does not align with this neighborhood that has been established over 60 years ago. We take great pride in our properties on Morand St and to add 3 properties to this corner does not meet the current standards that have been in place for decades.

Most homes are 77 foot frontage and to "squeeze" another home between 965 Morand and 991 Morand is completely ridiculous.

Adding another driveway to the front of this property and another home on the side of the current home would only make this corner more congested.

Barton St is a quite residential road with young children living on the corner at 1011 Morand and adding another driveway on this small street would only cause more danger for this neighborhood.

We would like to ensure that our voice is heard and that we will not agree to this proposal and hope that it will be escalated before Mr. Badour makes any changes.

It is not right to add more properties on a corner to make up for lost revenue that Mr. Badour may have incurred since he purchased his home back in July 2022. The rest of the residents of Morand St should not have to sacrifice the values of our homes and street scape to make up for this.

We are personally already dealing with a massive home being built at 980 Morand with no say on how enormous it is and it has completely blocked our view of the road. This was unfair that we are now subjected to a home that towers over all of the homes on our block.

The meeting that is scheduled for August 24th should be in person and not over zoom as we feel we will not get a voice for our OPPOSITION to his project.

We hope to have a response back Ms. Watson and appreciate your time in reviewing our concerns

6- Lidia and Domenic Zuccato- Neighbours – 1075 Morand

As long time residents of 1075 Morand St. we strongly oppose the proposed changes planned for 991 Morand St. as it would totally change the neighbourhood landscape. We would very much appreciate your consideration to keep our neighbourhood as is.

7- Kenneth Stewart – Neighbour – 1010 Ducharme

I am writing you in regards to the letter we received for the lot amendment to 991 Morand. I am in strong disagreement With granting a lot size below the by-law requirement. It will negatively impact the cohesion, traffic, aesthetic, and value of properties in the area. My concern is not so much, with the individual property but rather the precedent it sets. With the older homes in the neighbourhood it would allow for a dramatic and detrimental change in housing which would have irreparable consequences. There are a large number of alternatives in the city of Windsor that would meet the lot width for whichever building is being proposed and would better fit improving those areas. It is my strong belief that many will be very disappointed if the amendment is approved. Please consider the residents in this decision above that of the developers. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please respond to my email to inform me that it has been read and with any updates to this application for amendment to 991 Miranda lot.

8- Mr. Douglas Newman – neighbour- at 1010 Morand,

Gave a verbal appeal in regards to 991 Morand. His points are as such for his opposition: The severance will lower the price and value of the homes surrounding it; this lot will have 3 houses being built on it versus 1 house per lot for the surrounding parcels.

All surrounding lots are 75 ft. lots and now this one will much be much smaller; its been this way for 60 years why change it now.

This neighbourhood has traffic problem where you have a fair amount of speeders, and increase of traffic on a residential road will create more noise in the neighbourhood.

9 - Tony Sisti neighbour - 891 Morand St (also copied City Council)

I was just informed and floored that the city is considering that the lot at 991 Morand St. may be divided into 3 lots. Neighbours are concerned about the impact this might have on our adjoining properties and the overall character of our neighborhood. Changes like this is very unsettling, especially since it seems to deviate from the established norms and regulations set by our city. Zoning regulations and by-laws are in place to maintain the character of neighborhoods and ensure that development aligns with community standards. The major problem is that there is not to enough frontage (the minimum required in the by-laws) to house 3 lots. The minimum requirement change will open a pandora's box. The message the city is sending to Windsorites is that every lot in the city can be doubled. Even for city planners to consider this change is ludicrous.

We totally understand the housing shortage in the province but ruining the neighbourhood by dividing the normal sized lot into three small lots does nothing other than cheapening the area. Let me make this as clear as I can, we vehemently oppose this radical change and the proposal in our neighbourhood.

More importantly what this city has to do is regulate the absentee landlords that look for nothing but to make a buck. Letting the lands and homes remain dormant and unattended to does nothing but fester and create crime. All one has to do is look at what matty maroun did to the west end.

If the city is adamant in making space for homes, they have plenty of land around the airport and in other places to develop. Just like doug ford and his Greenbelt sell off, I am certain the city can do the same. Hundreds of developers would be willing to service and develop the lands.

10 - Dan and Rose Plesa – neighbours - 1020 Morand

We are opposed to this application due to the negative effects it will have on our neighborhood. The density of this proposed development far exceeds the surrounding neighbourhood. It should not be allowed to proceed.

11- Mary Elizabeth Paniccia – Neighbour – 931 Morand St.

Back in 1962 we purchased our lot on Morand St. We were the third house built on Morand. Our lot was purchased ,primarily because of the lot size. This was true for the many lot purchases that followed. Now, a new purchaser comes along and wants to ruin our neighbourhood by cutting up 991 Morand into postage stamp size lots to make a profit. Why were we not included in the decision to allow this to happen? A committee of citizens who have probably not even seen this beautiful, well taken care of neighbourhood are being allowed to make this important decision. The home owners, should have had a notice sent to us to inform us that this was being considered.

There is never a problem sending out our tax notices.

We strongly disagree with the way this matter has been handled and strongly disagree that it should be approved. We don't want these small lots on Morand. Please consider our thoughts in this matter.

12 - Doris Roback – Neighbour – 950 Morand

I understand that Mr. Badour has put forward a request to have the lot at 991 Morand severed for the creation of 2 new Lots (Lots B & C), with reduced minimum Lot width (Lot C only) and reduced side yard widths for the retained and severed lots.

I have been a resident of Morand Avenue since the 1960's when my husband built our home. We purchased the property due to its size to be able to erect a house that proportional to the size of the lot and provide enough space between the neighbours to provide privacy and space. As the years progressed, all the homes in this neighbourhood have continued to be wide and long for the purpose of construction of large homes.

For decades this neighbourhood has consisted of ranch and double storey homes with wide lots. The homes from Howard Avenue right down to Sixth Concession were constructed in this manner.

Squeezing new homes together and making smaller lots with little or no space between them is not conducive to the type of homes in this neighbourhood. The price of homes is also determined by lot size and if smaller homes on tiny lots are allowed, the price of our larger lots will be affected.

I am against the severing of the lots and the proposed reduction of the side yards and the minimum lot width at 991 Morand.

Our neighbourhood consists of beautiful large lots with large frontages and widths. Those features should stay consistent in this area to keep our neighbourhood unique.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): 2729884 ONTARIO INC

Subject Lands: LOT 110 & PART LOT 111 ON REGISTERED PLAN 392 and known as
Municipal Number 1044-1052 WYANDOTTE ST W

Zoning: Commercial CD2.2

RELIEF: Creation of a combined use building and parking area with 12
spaces with minimum required parking, required loading spaces and
separation of parking area from a habitable room window

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Vijay Vasantgadkar, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Vasantgadkar confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Dante Gatti

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): ADRIAN LEO MARENTETTE

Subject Lands: LOT 37 & PART LOT 38 ON REGISTERED PLAN 1070 and known as
Municipal Number 7995 CLAIRVIEW AVE

Zoning: Residential RD1.2

RELIEF: Proposed addition to an existing Single Unit Dwelling with reduced
minimum rear yard depth.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Adrian Marentette, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Marentette outlines he was not aware of any conditions, and the chair response there are no conditions. Mr. Marentette is in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. The Chair asks if this for rental purpose, and Mr. Marentette outlines this is just an addition to his house. The area is 1600 sq. feet.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Dante Gatti

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED/** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): OLA HIJAZI HOLDING CORP., MOHAMAD AL-MAAZ

Subject Lands: LOTS 797 TO 800 & PART LOT 801 ON REGISTERED PLAN 1126 and known as Municipal Number 3203 WALKER RD

Zoning: Commercial CD1.3

RELIEF: Creation of a medical office in an existing commercial plaza with reduced parking rate.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mohamad Al-Maaz, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Simion outlines that the medical office is in an existing commercial plaza with reduced area and will either remove encroachment items or enter into an encroachment agreement.

Mr. Cerasa asks if walker road offers public transportation. Ms. Amicarelli outlines that there are no bike lanes on Walker Road and offers public transportation. The Chair outlines if the sign is on City property. He realizes there is a corner cut-off and it seems the by-law sign is right there. Ms. Mio, outlines there encroachments, that would be required to be removed or enter an agreement encroachment with the Public Works department. Ms. Mio outlines that an onsite review will be conducted. The Chair asks how many square feet is the medical office. Mr. Al-Maaz outlines there are 2 current buildings and asks for confirmation of which is the medical building. Mr. Al-Maaz, outlines the medical building is 3400 sq. feet, and the building for the medical site is there, and the alternative is for after 7pm use as an office building. The Chair asks if there is access to Alley. Mr. Al-Maaz outlines no access to the alley. He outlines that construction has not started. Once approval gained, he will get the building department. The Chair asks for confirmation of the required Parking as per by-law. Mr. Zwayyed confirms Twenty-four (24) medical spaces for the office and one for the additional building is required.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): AGBABA HOLDINGS CORPORATION

Subject Lands: LOT 68 & BLOCK D ON REGISTERED PLAN 50 and known as
Municipal Number 1026 CALIFORNIA AVE

Zoning: Residential RD1.3

RELIEF: Creation of a single unit dwelling with reduced minimum Lot width,
Lot area and rear yard depth.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mark Agbaba, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Agbaba confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Agbaba, with respect to the Landscaping comments would like some clarifications. Mr. Fediuk outlines a number of trees may require removal during development, and the condition is for the applicant to consult with himself and provide a tree inventory and if there were replacements required, and based on the two trees already there, must spread between the two properties. Mr. Agbaba is curious about the removal of the trees and is this a necessity, or is necessary to be a condition? Mr. Fediuk outlines it is a matter to confirm they are going to be replaced. Mr. Agbaba outlines for curb appeal, these trees will not interfere with his landscaping.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): MARKO AGBABA, SANJA AGBABA

Subject Lands: LOT 67 & BLOCK D ON REGISTERED PLAN 50 and known as
Municipal Number 1028 CALIFORNIA AVE

Zoning: Residential RD1.3

RELIEF: Creation of a single unit dwelling with reduced minimum lot width,
lot area and rear yard depth.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mark Agbaba, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Agbaba confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): ROBERT ARNOLD BAREI, LISA BAREI

Subject Lands: PART LOT 126 ON REGISTERED PLAN 1478 and known as
Municipal Number 4135 DOUGALL AVE

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

REQUEST: Conveyance of the above noted lands, as shown on the attached
drawing for the purpose of creating a new Lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mike Stamp, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Stamp confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations, and points out this is an expired application and originally there was no conditions, and he is unsure how to fulfil giving the timeline for the sale of the house on 4135 Dougall and a separate lot to sell. He feels that connections were not part of this, and drawings have been provided to review the sewers and the water service and he has contacted outside agencies, and is unsure how to show these existing services on drawings. He outlines the conditions to be in place to satisfy a few with the seller. He asks for further information. Ms. Mio, the creation of a new Lot requires servicing on the new and retained, and this drawing must be provided and a permit to have the lot to be serviced. With respect to the overall property, it is for confirmation that there is servicing and a contractor with camera can provide this. For the new lot, a permit is required to have services on the frontage. Mr. Stamp feels as long there are existing services in place, he is not sure that this is applicable. HE outlines that the new purchaser should be the ones responsible for the connections and the permits to work in the right of way, and it would be placed in the agreement for the purchase and sale. He is not sure why this is a responsibility. The chair outlines the Act out lines that all new lots must be serviced. Mr. Stamp points out there are existing services and it is obvious, it is just that this should not be a responsibility of the existing owners. Ms. Mio, outlined she would further review with management in her area, to see that if it is in the agreement of purchase and sale, this may fulfill the condition. Mr. Stamp outlines the same has been agreed with Forestry for the trees, it will be in the purchase and sale agreement. Mr. Cerasa asks if the conditions would be entering into an agreement. Mr. Balsamo outlines that it be approved with conditions, and the City could come back and remove those conditions. Ms. Mio will confirm. Ms. Simion outlines that we are not able to change the conditions. Ms. Mio will further update the applicant. Mr. Cerasa asks that the services could be located across from the property, and this is a way to protect the city as well.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): RICHARD JOHN LEBLANC, BRENDA ROSE LEBLANC

Subject Lands: LOT 3 ON REGISTERED PLAN 1607 and known as Municipal Number 3150 ROBINET RD

Zoning: Residential RD1.1

REQUEST: The conveyance of the said lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new Lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Richard Leblanc, Owner
Brenda Leblanc, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Golob outlines the application, on behalf of the absent applicants would like to create a new lot, and he reviews the application and outlines they have already paid for servicing of both lots.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Dante Gatti

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): OMAR ALBARAHMEH, SANDRA RAMDIAL, REX RAMDIAL

Subject Lands: LOT 7 & PART LOT 8 ON REGISTERED PLAN 343 and known as
Municipal Number 547 DOUGALL AVE

Zoning: Residential RD3.1

RELIEF: Creation of a new 4-unit multiple dwelling with minimum lot width
and lot area.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Antonio Neeves, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Neeves confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Mohammed Baki

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): THMC WINDSOR INC

Subject Lands: PART LOT 87 ON CONCESSION 1, PART BLOCKS G & H ON REGISTERED PLAN 315, PART 12 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-7370, PARTS 1, 2, 5 & 6 AND PART OF PART 4 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-20656. And known as Municipal Number 600-718 TECUMSEH RD E

Zoning: Commercial CD3.3

RELIEF: The creation of a new lot at the the rear of an existing major Commercial Centre with minimum required parking spaces.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Amy Farkas, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Dante Gatti declares conflict on this item.

The Chair calls for a motion to hear both items Concurrently A-054/23 and B-037/23 - PART LOT 87 ON CONCESSION 1, PART BLOCKS G & H ON REGISTERED PLAN 315, PART 12 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-7370, PARTS 1, 2, 5 & 6 AND PART OF PART 4 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-20656. and known as Municipal Number 600-718 TECUMSEH RD E concurrently. Moved and supported.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Farkas confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Mohammed Baki

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): THMC WINDSOR INC

Subject Lands: PART LOT 87 ON CONCESSION 1, PART BLOCKS G & H ON REGISTERED PLAN 315, PART 12 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-7370, PARTS 1, 2, 5 & 6 AND PART OF PART 4 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-20656. and known as Municipal Number 600-718 TECUMSEH RD E

Zoning: Commercial CD3.3

REQUEST: To provide an easement for servicing.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Amy Farkas, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Dante Gatti declares conflict on this item

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Mohammed Baki

To hear both items A-054/23 and B-037/23 - PART LOT 87 ON CONCESSION 1, PART BLOCKS G & H ON REGISTERED PLAN 315, PART 12 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-7370, PARTS 1, 2, 5 & 6 AND PART OF PART 4 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-20656. and known as Municipal Number 600-718 TECUMSEH RD E concurrently.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Farkas, confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Mohammed Baki

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): VITO MAGGIO, MICHELLE MAGGIO

Subject Lands: PART LOT 102 & PART WATER LOT ON CONCESSION 1, PART 2 ON REFERENCE PLAN 12R-8931 and known as Municipal Number 3422 RIVERSIDE DR E

Zoning: Residential RD1.1

RELIEF: Construction of detached garage in front of an existing SUD with minimum front yard depth, east side yard width and maximum accessory building height.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Andrew Booth, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Booth confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Dante Gatti

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): JAWID QADER KHAN

Subject Lands: LOT 47 ON REGISTERED PLAN 1417 and known as Municipal Number 0 DUFFERIN PL (VACANT LOT NORTH OF 1234 DUFFERIN PLACE)

Zoning: Residential RD2.2

RELIEF: Construction of a Single Unit Dwelling with reduced minimum lot area and parking rate.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Vijay Vasantgadkar, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

The Agent confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): AMANDA JO SANTIA

Subject Lands: LOT 20 ON REGISTERED PLAN 502 and known as Municipal Number 871 WINDERMERE RD

Zoning: Residential RD2.2 S.20 (1) 267

REQUEST: The conveyance of said lands, as shown on the attached drawing for the purpose of creating a new Lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Amanda Santia, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Santia confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

Mr. Gatti asks of the two widths of the lots, and it is determined that this consent is for an existing semidetached side by side, and therefore width of the lots are not required.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Joe Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): MOHAMED TABIB

Subject Lands: Lots 44, 45, and Part of Closed Alley on Registered Plan 948; Lots 23, 24, Part Lot 25, Lots 29, 30 and Part of Closed Alley on Registered Plan 1275; Lots 19-23, Part of Lot 24, and Part of Closed Alley on Registered Plan 1335; and Lots 582-598, Part of Lots 579-581 and Part of Closed Alley on Registered Plan 1014 and known as Municipal Number 1843-1896 NORTHWAY AVE

Zoning: Residential RD2.2

RELIEF: Construction of a semi-detached dwelling exceeding maximum front yard paving and maximum gross floor area main building.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mohamed Tabib, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Tabib outlines that there are no exclusions of properties and asks for an opportunity to share the screen. The Chair asks for confirmation. Ms. Simion outlines the applications have asked for the exclusive of the driveways variance for certain driveways. Mr. Tabib outlines he was directed by Administration to not include those addresses. Mr. Tabib outlines that due to the Bylaw last year which changed, has allowed for the driveway variance that is before them today. He outlined that the zoning previously allowed for it, and now it is not permitted. He outlines he is in agreement with the paving.

Mr. Tabib shares his screen to allow for a visual of what he is proposing. The committee reviews the sharepoint and outlines he is not asking for those addresses to be excluded. Ms. Simion directs Ms. Watson to review the application to see what the applicant applied for. Ms. Watson outlines that all applications are available online on the COA website and confirms that the application was made with the exclusion of those addresses in question.

The Chair outlines the maximum front yard paving, which is a 13% increase, and the Chair asks if there would be harm to the entire subdivision, if this is granted and included. Mr. Atkinson, outlines that the impact is not significant and it is a procedural matter, and the requirements of the Planning act, and possibly a need to defer, or approve as requested, with the need to re-apply for the additional 2 properties.

Options are given to the applicant on how he would like to proceed.

Mr. Tabib expresses he has been waiting to proceed, and this would possibly delay. He outlines previously there was a reduction, and he followed suit. Mr. Atkinson outlined they were not included and this could be negligible. Mr. Tabib outlines this was a misguided communication and it is a big difference and saves time and money. Ms. Watson asks Mr. Tabib if he received the consultation notes prior to applying. The only way to identify if it is an error, and we can address this moving forward, the option would be to approve today, so that the construction can still commence. We will discuss moving forward to verify the situation. It was agreed to proceed with the current application, and review the fee prior to re-applying with an amendment in the near future. Mr. Balsamo outlines that there should be a friendly amendment to the application to include the included properties and addresses administration.

It is suggested that the excluded addresses be included and to move forward as per the Committee.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Frank Cerasa

Seconded by: Mohammed Baki

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for with the addition of an amendment to the recommendation of the 2 Lots known as **1843-1896 NORTHWAY AVE** and include the **1867-1869 and 1873-1875 NORTHWAY AVE**.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): FARHI HOLDINGS CORPORATION

Subject Lands: BLOCK 42 ON SUBDIVISION PLAN 12M-678 and known as Municipal Number 1530 LAUZON RD

Zoning: Residential RD3.1 subject to S.20(1) 439

RELIEF: A newly created lot with minimum front yard depth (severed parcel) and lot area (retained parcel).

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Amy Farkas, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair asks to hear both items **A-058/23** and **B-039/23** BLOCK 42 ON SUBDIVISION PLAN 12M-678 and known as Municipal Number 1530 LAUZON RD concurrently. Moved and supported.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Farkas confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): FARHI HOLDINGS CORPORATION

Subject Lands: BLOCK 42 ON SUBDIVISION PLAN 12M-678 and known as Municipal Number 1530 LAUZON RD

Zoning: Residential RD3.1 subject to S.20(1) 439

REQUEST: Conveyance of said lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot with easements for access, parking, servicing and maintenance.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

The Chair asks to hear both items **A-058/23** and **B-039/23** BLOCK 42 ON SUBDIVISION PLAN 12M-678 and known as Municipal Number 1530 LAUZON RD concurrently. Moved and supported.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Farkas confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Frank Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

After reviewing the draft minutes presented by the Secretary-Treasurer, it was

Moved by Joe Balsamo,
Seconded by Frank Cerasa,

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Hearing held **July 27, 2023** **BE**
ADOPTED.

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting accordingly adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Mike Sleiman, Chairperson

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer

