



CITY OF WINDSOR COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

FOR THE HEARING OF

June 27, 2024

A virtual hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on June 27, 2024, by Video Conference. The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Committee Members

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

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer
Riley Dufour, Committee Clerk

Regrets:

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

Planning & Building Services Department

Greg Atkinson, Deputy City Planner
Simona Simion, Planner II
Kareem Kudi, Planner II
Diane Radulescu, Planner II
Brian Velocci, Site Plan Approval Officer
Connor O'Rourke, Zoning Co-ordinator
Stefan Pavlica, Zoning Co-ordinator
Pierre Bordeaux, Zoning Co-ordinator
Jillian Bunston, Student
Stefan Fediuk, Landscape Architect

Engineering & Geomatics Department

Andrew Borkoski, Technologist I

Transportation Planning Department

Elara Mehrilou, Transportation Planner I
Chris Gerardi, Transportation Planner

* * * * *

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.

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): LUCKY STAR DEVELOPMENTS INC

Subject Lands: PLAN 889; LOT 120; PLAN 670; E PT LOT 43 and known as
Municipal Number 1153 OTTAWA ST

Zoning: Commercial CD2.2

RELIEF: Construction of a combined use building with dwelling unit located
on the same level as non-residential use, with reduced minimum
number of parking spaces, type "A" accessible parking space, and
parking area separations,

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

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

Mr. Sovran outlines they will do their best to provide the accessible parking space, however the separations would be limited, and currently there is 0 parking, with future renovations they may be able to provide an accessible parking space.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: M. Bakki

Seconded by: J. Balsamo

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that Minor variances 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 in the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for with no conditions outside those established through Site Plan Control. And that the requested minor variance 3 from the provisions 24.24.1.1 of Zoning By-Law 8600 **BE DENIED**.

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): HEYDAR MUSSAVI

Subject Lands: PLAN 12M-524, LOT 119 and known as Municipal Number 3869 ZANZIBAR CRES

Zoning: Residential RD1.2

RELIEF: Construct addition to existing single unit dwelling with reduced minimum rear yard depth.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Abdullah Hussein, Agent
Linda Ali, 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. Hussein confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. The chair confirms the proposed use and if it will be an ADU. Mr. Hussein outlines construction has not started, and it is not going to an ADU just an addition to the existing home.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

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): 2486311 ONTARIO INC

Subject Lands: CON 1; PT LOTS 96 & 97; RP 12R1418; PT PART 3; RP 12R15509; PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 1850 WALKER RD

Zoning: Manufacturing MD1.2

REQUEST: The severance of lands as shown on the attached drawing, for the creation of two new lots.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Tom Mayhew, 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. Mayhew 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: Dante Gatti

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): LUDWIG PATRICK DOBMEIER

Subject Lands: PLAN 557 LOTS 166 TO 171;PT CLOSED ALLEY and known as
Municipal Number 1930 DOMINION BLVD

Zoning: Residential RD1.1

REQUEST: To sever alley, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose
of a Lot addition.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Tom Hogarth, 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. Hogarth confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration 2 sever the alley and equally add to abutting lots.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: Joe Balsamo

Seconded by: Dante Gatti

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): SITAL SINGH GARHA, NIRMAL KAUR

Subject Lands: SANDWICH CON 1; PT LOT 72; RP 12R18645; PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 1350 PELLETIER ST

Zoning: Manufacturing MD2.1

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

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, 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

Ms. Pillon-Abbs, 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: M. Baki

Seconded by: J. 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): ADI FAMILY HOLDINGS INC.
Subject Lands: CON 2 PT LOT 104 and known as Municipal Number 3940 NORTH SERVICE RD E
Zoning: Manufacturing MD1.1
REQUEST: Consent for a lease that is greater than 21 years.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Ralphael Romeral, 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. Romeral confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Romeral would like to confirm the consent certificates documentation. The Chair outlines the city will be in touch.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Rick Kriza is present and without audio. Secretary-Treasurer outlines of the proposal as per the development as per Mr. Kriza. Mr. Romeral, outlines this is for a battery storage warehouse. Ms. Simona outlines this is permitted under the proposed use.

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. 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): DEVON PLACE INCORPORATED

Subject Lands: CON 5 PT LOT 14;RP 12R8120 PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 3903 KATHLEEN ST

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

RELIEF: To accommodate the existing single unit dwelling, with reduced minimum lot width and area for the severed and retained lots and reduced minimum side yard width for the severed Lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mike Davis, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: J. Balsamo
Seconded by: M. Baki

That file numbers A-030/24 and B-018/2, CON 5 PT LOT 14; RP 12R8120 PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 3903 KATHLEEN ST, are concurrent and will be heard together.

The Secretary-Treasurer outlines there have been objections from residents provided prior to the hearing, and have been shared with the Committee, Administration and Agent for their review and response if required.

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. Davis confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. He outlines the developers are Rosati Group, and they are not in agreement with the recommendation from administration for Denial. Mr. Davis share visuals with those in attendance and provides an overview of the Project Site. He outlines this is a combined application that will create a new residential lot, with variances. Both lots will contain new dwellings. He outlines there are no sideline reductions (as listed in the administration report), that are in error. The review from his team, outlines that the staff reports are relied on and provides clarifications in the reports to not be compatible.

Mr. Davis outlines that previous OLT findings, and since 2002 there have been numerous updates to the provincial housing policies. The scope of the previous application is different, and he would like to point out that there is no professional planner evidence that supported that previous OMB decision. Mr. Davis outlines today's current applications had a comprehensive overview of the neighbourhood within 250 m and provides that similar lot frontages, are about at 30% of an equal or lesser frontage. He would like to challenge this compared to the administrative report. Mr. Davis discuss the streetscape pattern and compared the lot pattern from a street view of the propose and its compatibility in his opinion. Mr. Davis provides a visual of a 250 m study for discussion, of the severance analysis, with respect to depth and width and not withstanding the overall area. He feels there are no direct impacts to neighbouring properties. Mr. Davis outlines with respect to the overall neighbouring comments/objections, and addresses from analysis, a demonstration of influence, and can't replicate what is already there. Mr. Davis showed insufficient depth to no support new lot creation, and outlines this situation is limited and can support.

He would like to ask the committee to support and grant the application, however if they are not ready to make decisions today, to defer the application for further review from administration for their granting.

M. Cerasa asks the applicant about market value, and a possible diminishing of such, or average in the area of the buildings. Mr. Davis seeks clarification of the "new dwelling and _____

would it be in line with the selling price of those in the area". Mr. Davis can't speak to the real estate aspect of the question and the guidance an analysis. He outlines he can speak to the tactics of the aide in the provisions of new housing and small-scale infill, with affordable housing. This is outside the scope of his profession. The Chair outlines the applications, and that this was denied prior at the OLT. He has requested details with new evidence that would support this for granting. Mr. Davis outlines the zoning by-law has changed, and at such time, the variances were not minor, and with the updates it has changed to benefit these consents/variances. Mr. Atkinson confirms that the zoning by-law has been updated, and the urban design and the OP has not changed from 2003 when the previous application has changed. The Agent outlines that if there is the opportunity to reconfigure these lots, and the envelope there is still left opportunity to accommodate and they are not requesting any other metrics, and this is the only logical divides. M. Gatti, outlines that the argument is here, and why is this not sufficient or may differ. Mr. Atkinson outlines that primarily the lot size was our basis for the denial, he outlines that the block on Morand and Ducharme with respect to lot size, and the City of Windsor's intensification designs, and the policies haven't changed from 2003 with updates to the Zoning By-Law 8600. The PPS has been updated and given the proposal is the same as 2003, it doesn't meet the intent of the OPP and Urban Design Plan currently.

The Chair asks for public presentation. Richard Stieler, Daniel Bussey, Brian Kukhta, Dave Gillard, provide their comments and objections. They shared this has already been appealed and are surprised it came to before the committee again. The neighbours outline for safety reasons and property issues such as flooding, soil erosion and trees that are matured will result in flooding in the future.

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **DENIED**:

The request fails to meet the following Official Plan evaluation criteria for a minor variance Section 11.6.6.2: When reviewing an application for minor variance the Committee of Adjustment shall be satisfied that:

(a) The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan is maintained.

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): DEVON PLACE INCORPORATED

Subject Lands: CON 5 PT LOT 14;RP 12R8120 PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 3903 KATHLEEN ST

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

REQUEST: The severance of lands as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mike Davis, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by: J. Balsamo
Seconded by: M. Baki

That file numbers A-030/24 and B-018/2, CON 5 PT LOT 14;RP 12R8120 PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 3903 KATHLEEN ST, are concurrent and will be heard together.

The Secretary-Treasurer outlines there have been objections from residents provided prior to the hearing, and have been shared with the Committee, Administration and Agent for their review and response if required.

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. Davis confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. He outlines the developers are Rosati Group, and they are not in agreement with the recommendation from administration for Denial. Mr. Davis share visuals with those in attendance and provides an overview of the Project Site. He outlines this is a combined application that will create a new residential lot, with variances. Both lots will contain new dwellings. He outlines there are no sideline reductions (as listed in the administration report), that are in error. The review from his team, outlines that the staff reports are relied on and provides clarifications in the reports to not be compatible.

Mr. Davis outlines that previous OLT findings, and since 2002 there have been numerous updates to the provincial housing policies. The scope of the previous application is different, and he would like to point out that there is no professional planner evidence that supported that previous OMB decision. Mr. Davis outlines today's current applications had a comprehensive overview of the neighbourhood within 250 m and provides that similar lot frontages, are about at 30% of an equal or lesser frontage. He would like to challenge this compared to the administrative report. Mr. Davis discuss the streetscape pattern and compared the lot pattern from a street view of the propose and its compatibility in his opinion. Mr. Davis provides a visual of a 250 m study for discussion, of the severance analysis, with respect to depth and width and notwithstanding the overall area. He feels there are no direct impacts to neighbouring properties. Mr. Davis outlines with respect to the overall neighbouring comments/objections, and addresses from analysis, a demonstration of influence, and can't replicate what is already there. Mr. Davis showed insufficient depth to no support new lot creation, and outlines this situation is limited and can support.

He would like to ask the committee to support and grant the application, however if they are not ready to make decisions today, to defer the application for further review from administration for their granting.

M. Cerasa asks the applicant about market value, and a possible diminishing of such, or average in the area of the buildings. Mr. Davis seeks clarification of the "new dwelling and would it be in line with the selling price of those in the area". Mr. Davis can't speak to the real

estate aspect of the question and the guidance an analysis. He outlines he can speak to the tactics of the aide in the provisions of new housing and small-scale infill, with affordable housing. This is outside the scope of his profession. The Chair outlines the applications, and that this was denied prior at the OLT. He has requested details with new evidence that would support this for granting. Mr. Davis outlines the zoning by-law has changed, and at such time, the variances were not minor, and with the updates it has changed to benefit these consents/variances. Mr. Atkinson confirms that the zoning by-law has been updated, and the urban design and the OP has not changed from 2003 when the previous application has changed. The Agent outlines that if there is the opportunity to reconfigure these lots, and the envelope there is still left opportunity to accommodate and they are not requesting any other metrics, and this is the only logical divides. M. Gatti, outlines that the argument is here, and why is this not sufficient or may differ. Mr. Atkinson outlines that primarily the lot size was our basis for the denial, he outlines that the block on Morand and Ducharme with respect to lot size, and the City of Windsor's intensification designs, and the policies haven't changed from 2003 with updates to the Zoning By-Law 8600. The PPS has been updated and given the proposal is the same as 2003, it doesn't meet the intent of the OPP and Urban Design Plan currently.

The Chair asks for public presentation. Richard Stieler, Daniel Bussey, Brian Kukhta, Dave Gillard, provide their comments and objections. They shared this has already been appealed and are surprised it came to before the committee again. The neighbours outline for safety reasons and property issues such as flooding, soil erosion and trees that are matured will result in flooding in the future.

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE DENIED for the following reasons:**

- a) The requested consent does not meet the following Official Plan Policy for infill development, which requests regard for the existing development pattern- Section 8.7.2.3: Council will ensure that proposed development within an established neighbourhood is designed to function as an integral and complementary part of that area's existing development pattern by having regard for: (h) the pattern, scale and character of existing development.
- b) The concurrent minor variance application (A-030/24) is not supported, and consequently, the consent fails to meet the following Official Plan Policy- Section 11.4.4.3: Consents shall only be granted for the creation of lots which comply with the Zoning By-law and/or unless appropriate minor variances are also granted concurrently.

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): 1000596366 ONTARIO LIMITED

Subject Lands: SANDWICH EAST CON 2; PT LOTS 102 & 103; RP 12R29407 and known as Municipal Number 0 CENTRAL AVE (VACANT LOT NEXT NORTH OF 3400 CENTRAL AVE)

Zoning: Manufacturing MD1.4

RELIEF: Construction of a medical office with minimum reduced number of required parking spaces.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Colin McDonald, Agent
Wassim Saad,
Aaron Blata,

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. McDonald confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration and proceeds to provide a visual slide presentation of the proposed new medical center and the project overview. The presentation contents are a project overview, parking analysis and a facility model and functionality of the proposed by the agent. The request is for relief from parking only. The slides are attached to the minutes for review. Dr. Wassim Saad, outlines the use for the plaza, and discusses the practice. A site evaluation with respect to parking was in comparison to existing medical centers within the City of Windsor for comparison. Mr. Gatti asks for confirmation of the parking review and verification and the manual observed by Mr. Blata. Mr. Blata provides overview of the citations from the land use manual and land use 7.20 and his concerns are the walk-in clinic/urgent care vs an appointment only for parking requirements. The average rate is 2.99% for a walk-in clinic and in his report is 2.63% (394 spaces) 2.99% (448 spaces) and 6.30 is 3.67% (550 parking spaces) Their proposal is 446 parking spaces which is being proposed, this is for a medical office building. There is an area for bicycle spaces on the site, and with both components the site is fully accessible, and on a bus route and conducive to include all these outlets and components. Discussions surrounding the design and future opportunities for parking demands outside of the 546 and is there a contingency plan in place currently? Mr. McDonald outlines that in order to address there is a built-in tolerance if we may need reach capacity with respect to Mr. Blata's study charts. Mr. Blata outlines if required there is still room for 100 spaces. Mr. Balsamo outlines that if it is paid parking, that individuals may go to the abutting business for free parking, and if a fence could be erected to prevent this? Mr. McDonald outlines that a fence would be a starting point to deter this, and it would extend the walking distance if they did park further away. The fence would be a great addition. Mr. Gatti outlines that the spaces are as well a bit wider, and if they minimized the spaces they could have gained more? They felt more accessible space for parking was important for the staff, and even at capacity, accommodating this was extremely important for their patients. The outcome is if there is additional future parking for best practices needed, they could be able to use some of the greenspace surrounding the facility that could be used.

The Chair asks for public presentation. Jason Mattis, had a few concerns with respect to privacy, as this abuts his backyard for years, and to help aide as a noise buffer. His concerns are that flooding should be outlined and he felt it important to bring this forward. Brian Velocci, this is a matter and is addressed at Site-plan and the storm-water management is required to be captured onsite, so now the rainwater would be caught and forwarded to sewers, so this is better. Mr. Velocci adds that a fence could be a condition possibly, and the lightening is governed with SPC. There is also landscaping in the separation between the properties, would

be a condition as well to help with the esthetics and drainage. Resident – Mary-Jane expresses noise from increase in traffic and suggests fencing should be encouraged. Mr. Velocci, outlines this is zoned for this type of development and if zoned industrial, and if it is permitted, it will be established. These concerns have been received and maybe conditional at SPC.

Moved by: Danti Gatti

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): DANIEL MATTHEW HOULE

Subject Lands: PLAN 1478 PT LOT 134; and known as Municipal Number 3910
KENNEDY DR E

Zoning: Residential RD1.4

RELIEF: Construct a single unit dwelling exceeding maximum main building
gross floor area.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Daniel Houle, 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. Houle 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** 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): JASMINE MARIE LONG

Subject Lands: PLAN 231 PT LOT 5 and known as Municipal Number 1079
TUSCARORA ST

Zoning: Residential RD2.2

REQUEST: The severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new Lot. This is a technical severance.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Giacomo Ramieri, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Gatti declares a conflict with this item and removes himself from the 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. Ramieri confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Ramieri, outlines what a merger are with lots that are owned sided by side and merged onto title. Today they are looking for a severance.

The Chair asks for public presentation. Michael Nashed

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.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

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

Moved by **Dante Gatti**
Seconded by **Frank Cerasa**

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Hearing held **May 25, 2024, BE ADOPTED.**

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Mike Sleiman, Chairperson

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer