



three-car garage to be located a minimum distance of 194.7 metres from the front lot line and 25.19 metres from the northerly exterior side lot line. It should be noted that the lands are zoned General Rural (A1) and Hazard (H) in the former Township of Collingwood Zoning By-law No. 83-40; and that section 5.2(iii) of the By-law requires accessory buildings and structures to be located no closer to the street than the main building.

The land affected by this application is described as North Part Lot 15, Concession 12; (355971 The Blue Mountains-Euphrasia Townline);

Secretary/Treasurer stated that the Public Notice was circulated in accordance with the Planning Act. The Notice was provided to the applicant to post on the subject property.

Comments were received from the following:

*Grey County Planning Dept.* – subject property abuts Grey Road 119; comments should be received from the County of Grey Transportation and Public Safety (TAPS) Department; should favourable comments be received from TAPS then the County Planning Dept. would have no concerns.

*County of Grey Transportation and Public Safety (TAPS) Dept.* – no objection provided the applicant places the proposed structure in accordance with their structure setback policy of 23 metres from the centerline of the travelled road.

*Grey Sauble Conservation Authority* – no objection;

*Grey Bruce Public Health Unit* – no objection to the intent of the application but to avoid a reduction in sewage system performance level, the proposed garage must not locate within minimum OBC clearance distances of the existing treatment unit and distribution piping of the sewage system servicing the property, including disturbing any imported leaching bed fill;

*TOTBM Engineering & Public Works* – no comments

*TOTBM Planning Dept.* – no objection subject to the condition noted in planning staff report #PL.09.95.

Chair Metras then opened the meeting up to the public.

Stephanie Jackman, applicant, was in attendance. She stated that she wants to construct a garage as the old one had been torn down. The new garage will be placed in a slightly different location as the home now used to be where the barn was and wishes to put the garage back where the original home stood.

No other members of the public were in attendance to speak either in favour or in opposition to the application. Chair Metras then closed the public portion of the meeting.

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Bill Remus

THAT Planning Staff Report No. PL.09.95 be received.

Carried.

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Bill Remus

“THAT the Committee of Adjustment GRANT Minor Variance Application No. A13-2009 in order to permit a maximum 84 square metre detached three-car garage to be located a minimum distance of 194.7 metres from the front lot line and 25.19 metres from the northerly exterior side lot line on the subject property.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. That the maximum 84 square metre detached three-car garage be constructed substantially in accordance with the drawings submitted on July 22, 2009 with Minor Variance Application No. A13-2009.

**REASON FOR DECISION:**

The Committee is satisfied that the application meets the four tests for minor variance, as noted in the Planning Staff Report PL.09.95”. Carried.

**A14-2009 – Susan Meadows, Part Lot 6, Plan 377, #208581 Hwy.26 - Chair** Metras called the meeting to Order. Secretary/Treasurer read aloud the applications purpose and effect of the variance which is to consider a request by the applicant to construct a single detached dwelling on the subject property, with access obtained through an existing registered private right-of-way. It should be noted that the applicant would be demolishing the existing single detached dwelling prior to constructing the proposed new single detached dwelling.

The effect of this variance is to permit a new single detached dwelling on an existing lot of record with access obtained through an existing registered private right-of-way. It should be noted that the lands are zoned Residential (R3) and Private Open Space (OS2) in the former Township of Collingwood Zoning By-law No. 83-40; and that section 5.8(v) of the By-law requires an existing lot of record which has access to an improved public street by means of an existing registered private right-of-way or easement for vehicular access purposes to be permitted only through site specific locations.

The land affected by this application is described as Part Lot 6, Plan 377; Part 7, RP 16R-6499; together with a right-of-way over Parts 2 and 5, RP 16R-6499 and Block A, Plan 377; (208581 Highway 26).

Secretary/Treasurer stated that the Public Notice was circulated in accordance

with the Planning Act. The Notice was provided to the applicant to post on the subject property.

Comments were received from the following:

*Grey/Bruce Public Health Unit* – no objection to the intent however prior to the demolition of the existing dwelling they recommend the applicant pursue steps to ensure that the property can accommodate the proposed construction and a new sewage system designed under the requirements of the 2006 OBC; also, GSCA regulatory requirements must be satisfied under OBC law prior to issuance of a sewage system permit;

*Grey County Planning Dept.* – is of the opinion that this application should not be dealt with through a minor variance application with the appropriate mechanism being a zoning by-law amendment and recommend refusal of the application;

*Grey Sauble Conservation Authority* – no objection but would recommend a detailed engineered drainage plan be completed to ensure that impacts to adjacent properties do not occur; a permit will be required from the GSCA for site grading within the regulated area which includes the sewage disposal system;

*TOTBM Engineering Dept.* – not a municipal road and no municipal drain is required; the resident should construct a side yard drain/swale that will provide an outlet from the private road;

*TOTBM Planning Dept.* – no objection subject to the condition noted in the planning staff report #PL.09.96.

Discussion on whether or not it is necessary to proceed through the minor variance process if the dwelling is still existing. Planner Bryan Pearce clarified that because the applicant wishes to demolish the existing dwelling and re-build then relief is required so that the application is in compliance with the zoning by-law. Further, lot development provisions under Section 5.8 requires the registered private right-of-way to be recognized through the zoning provisions.

Some discussion on the plan of subdivision affecting the proposal took place as well as the closeness of the well to the proposed dwelling as shown on the applications site plan. It was determined that this would be reviewed further through the building permit process.

Susan Meadows, applicant, and her spouse John Meadows were in attendance. Ms. Meadows stated that she was of the understanding that if it were a dug well then 100 feet from the proposed dwelling is required and if it were a drilled well

then 50 feet is the requirement. She noted that the proposed well will be a drilled one.

No other members of the public were in attendance to speak either in favour or

