

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable and upon request

If this variance is approved, it will permit the construction of a turret, no higher than 11m, where section 32 subsection 211 permits a maximum of 8m. It was also noted that the height for a pitched roof is calculated at the midpoint between the eaves and the ridge, from the finished grade of the front of the building.

The land affected by this application is a vacant lot on Sunset Blvd. (Lora Bay) and described as Plan 16M18, Lot 16 (Township of Collingwood).

Secretary/Treasurer stated that the Public Hearing Notice was circulated in accordance with the *Planning Act*. The Notice was provided to the Applicant and was posted on the subject property.

Comments were received from the following:

Grey County Planning and Development Dept. – generally no development or site alteration may occur within the Significant Woodlands without an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) being provided; the County may waive this requirement should the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) deem it unnecessary; the County would have no objection provided the GSCA deems the EIS irrelevant in this instance;

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority – no concerns;

Lands and Resources (Historic Saugeen Metis) – no objection or opposition;

TOTBM Community Services – no concerns;

TOTBM Infrastructure & Public Works (IPW) – no comments;

TOTBM Planning Dept. – recommends approval subject to the recommended condition as noted in Planning Staff Report #PDS.15.125;

Sharon Baker, owner of Lot 16 – concern with privacy issues.

Regarding Ms. Baker's concern with privacy issues on her Lot, it was noted that her Lot is currently vacant and no building(s) have been constructed to-date. It is assumed that Ms. Baker's concern is whenever she does build in the future, that this proposal would not be so high up that it would be looking down into her Lot/structure, creating a loss of privacy to her.

It was then noted to the Committee members that a revised drawing was submitted by the Agent to Planner Denise Whaley late on December 15, 2015. This is a result of the incorrect drawing being submitted at the time of application and the Agent was unaware until after the application and Public Notice had been circulated.

The Committee reviewed a comparison of the drawing submitted with the application and the revised drawing. It was apparent that the revised drawing was quite different than originally proposed and could change the proposal significantly. Although the "turret" would still be in conflict with the Municipal Zoning By-law's height restriction, visually it does not look as high as in the original drawing. However, it was unclear as to how the side views of the turret would now affect surrounding neighbours. It was thought that by looking at the turret from different angles, it could possibly now affect neighbours to the east and west.

Chairman Morgan then asked for comments/concerns from the public.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable and upon request

Janet Findlay & Brian Harkness, Lot 15 (320 Sunset Blvd) were in attendance. Mr. Harkness stated that they found the first drawing to be inconclusive of the purpose of the “turret” but if its purpose was only to provide light and ventilation then they would have no objection.

Mr. Patten, Agent/Applicant for the Owners, was in attendance. He noted that original concept was for the turret to be a skylight providing lighting on the second floor. The Owners are now requesting the turret to be on the right hand side to allow for more natural light and that the turret would have a room as a “hobby” space to the Owners. He stated that the windows would now be situated lower on the building than on the first submitted drawing.

The Committee members thought that the revision would appear to be significant and that a re-circulation of the Public Notice would be justified in order to allow surrounding neighbours and agencies the opportunity to be made aware of the revised drawing and to provide any comments/concerns in that regard.

That being said, there were two options to the Agent/Owners: - to either move forward with the original application and drawing and if granted, decide thereafter if they want to make a revision to the application. If so, it would require a whole new application and Town fees; or to ask for deferral of the original application until such time as the Owners decide what the best option is for them. Should they decide to keep the original application with the revised drawing, the Committee could re-circulate the Public Notice with a nominal fee being paid.

The Agent/Applicant requested a ten minute break to speak to the Owners. All parties removed themselves from the Committee Room to allow themselves the opportunity to discuss their options.

Upon their return, it was Agent/Owners decision to defer the original application at this time.

Mr. Cumming then spoke on behalf of himself and his wife Maria. He stated that his wife’s passion is to paint and has for along time wished to have an area such as that of the turret to spend her time doing so. The revised location of the turret is to provide more natural light into the space of her painting area.

At this time Mr. Harkness stated that when they built on their Lot, there was an exception in the zoning by-law that limited the height of the structure to two storeys. This was to provide protection and privacy to other residences in the surrounding neighbourhood and to limit the massiveness of any structure to be built. He noted that should the Owners come back to the Committee with a similar drawing as to the one that was revised, he felt it could possibly create concerns and/or objections from other neighbours. It was Mr. Harkness’ feeling that the exception was put in place for a reason and that all within it should have to abide by it.

Town Planner Denise Whaley spoke to the “exception” wherein it was put into the zoning by-law so that residences were limited to only two storeys to avoid massive buildings being built. As well, “two storeys” is interpreted in the zoning by-law as being eight metres maximum. However, in this case, it is only the “turret” that is out of compliance, not the whole building structure.

Janet Findlay commented that should this proposal be approved it would set a precedent for future buildings, with Committee member Waind stating that it would not be setting a precedence because each application is dealt with as site specific, being that any decision given is for that specific application only. Should any other similar application come before the Committee it would be reviewed and a decision made on the information given for that specific application.

The Committee members suggested to the Agent/Applicant and Owners to give close consideration to their proposal prior to re-submitting.

No other members of the public wished to speak either in favour of or in opposition to the application, Chairman Morgan then closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

Motion:

Moved by: Robert B. Waind

Seconded by:

Bill Remus

“THAT L. Patten being the Agent for the Owners of application No. A16-2015 and Owners John and Maria Cumming, request that the Committee of Adjustment DEFER Minor Variance No. A16-2015 in order that the revised drawing may be re-circulated to ensure the Public Notice and application are consistent for a further Public Hearing”.
Carried.

D. Correspondence: none

E. New and Unfinished Business:

E.1 – Appeal to Ontario Municipal Board – A12-2015 – Home Hardware Stores Ltd – the Secretary/Treasurer noted that one Appeal was received regarding this minor variance application. The required information was couriered to the OMB on December 14, 2015, which is within the required time frame. We now await a Hearing date from the OMB.

F. Next Meeting Date: January 20, 2016

G. Adjournment

Moved by: Robert B. Waind

THAT this Committee of Adjustment meeting now be adjourned. Carried.