



# **CITY OF WINDSOR COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

## **MINUTES**

**FOR THE HEARING OF**

**July 25, 2024**

A virtual hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on July 25, 2024, by Video Conference. The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Present:**

***Committee Members***

Dante Gatti, Chair (A)  
Joe Balsamo, Member  
Frank Cerasa, Member  
Mohammed Baki, Member

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer  
Riley Dufour, Committee Clerk

Regrets:

Mike Sleiman, Chair

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  
Zaid Zwayyed, Planner II  
Diana Radulescu, Planner I  
Brian Velocci, Site Plan Approval Officer  
Connor O'Rourke, Zoning Co-ordinator  
Piere Bordeaux, Zoning Co-ordinator  
Stefan Pavlica, Zoning Co-ordinator  
Stefan Fediuk, Landscape Architect

***Engineering & Geomatics Department***

Leah Marshall, Technologist I

***Transportation Planning Department***

Ellie Mehrilou, Transportation Engineer

\* \* \* \* \*

**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):** NC CAPITAL INC.

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 140 S PT LOT 9;N PT LOT 10 and known as Municipal Number 854 UNIVERSITY AVE E

**Zoning:** Residential RD2.2

**RELIEF:** Construct a semi-detached dwelling with ADUs exceeding maximum lot coverage - accessory building.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Clarke Gallie, 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. Gallie, 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):** ADEWALE DAWUD ADERINTO

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1045 S PT LOT 19; PT CLOSED ALLEY and known as  
Municipal Number 3842 WOODWARD BLVD

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.1

**REQUEST:** Create 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**

Mrs. 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: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: M. 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):** HAUSOLOGY INC.  
**Subject Lands:** PLAN 679; LOT 20 & PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 871 PILLETTE RD, 870 & 872 ARTHUR  
**Zoning:** Residential RD3.1  
**RELIEF:** Request for relief from minimum lot area and rear yard depth.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Applicant  
Nathan Caldwell, Owner

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

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

That file numbers A-035/24 and B-023/24, PLAN 679; LOT 20 & PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 871 PILLETTE RD, 870 & 872 ARTHUR are concurrent and will be heard together.

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**

Mrs. 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** 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):** HAUSOLOGY INC.

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 679; LOT 20 & PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 871 PILLETTE RD and 870 & 872 ARTHUR

**Zoning:** Residential RD3.1

**REQUEST:** Create two new lots.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Applicant

Nathan Caldwell, Owner

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by: J. Balsamo

Seconded by: M. Baki

That file numbers A-035/24 and B-023/24, PLAN 679; LOT 20 & PT LOT 21 and known as Municipal Number 871 PILLETTE RD, 870 & 872 ARTHUR are concurrent and will be heard together.

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**

Mrs. 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):** BASEMAH BOSSO

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 646; LOTS 178 TO 180 and known as Municipal Number 1485  
ERIE ST E

**Zoning:** Commercial CD1.3

**RELIEF:** Requesting relief from minimum front yard depth and minimum separation from a building wall containing a habitable room window for a combined use building.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Imran Khan, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

The Secretary-Treasurer outlines there have been an objection from resident at 1085 Gladstone provided prior to the hearing, and have been shared with the Committee, Administration and Agent for their review and response if required that included, greenspace use, parking and any possible damage that may be incurred and who would be responsible for paying these fees or reinstate the grounds.

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. Khan confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. He outlines all variances are existing and, in his opinion, the proposed are minor and has no issues.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: J. Balsamo

Seconded by: F. 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):** GILLES DENIS ST JULES, COLETTE MARGUERITE ST JULES

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1342 LOTS 28 TO 30 and known as Municipal Number 1617 & 1629 MARK AVE

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.2

**RELIEF:** Accommodate an accessory building exceeding maximum lot coverage with reduced minimum accessory building separation from rear lot line on retained lot.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Gilles & Collette St. Jules, Owners

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

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

That file numbers A-036/24 and B-024/24, PLAN 679; PLAN 1342 LOTS 28 TO 30 and known as Municipal Number 1617 & 1629 MARK AVE are concurrent and will be heard together.

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. and Mrs. Jules confirm 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: 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):** GILLES DENIS ST JULES, COLETTE MARGUERITE ST JULES  
**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1342 LOTS 28 TO 30 and known as Municipal Number 1617 & 1629 MARK AVE  
**Zoning:** Residential RD1.2  
**REQUEST:** Lot Addition.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Gilles & Collette St. Jules, Owners

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

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

That file numbers A-036/24 and B-024/24, PLAN 679; PLAN 1342 LOTS 28 TO 30 and known as Municipal Number 1617 & 1629 MARK AVE are concurrent and will be heard together.

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. and Mrs. Jules confirm 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: F. 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):** WINDSOR CITY

**Subject Lands:** CON 1; PT 59; PLAN 40; PT PARK LOTS 3 & 4; PLAN 656; PT CLOSED ALLEY and known as Municipal Number 3940 CARMICHAEL RD

**Zoning:** Green GD1.2

**RELIEF:** Minimum reduction in curb height.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

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

F. Cerasa asks about the purpose for the curb height. The applicant outlines that they have a grade plan, and it is due to drainage the required variance.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

John Moore, Resident – Mr. Moore expresses an opposition to the minor variance, and his concerns are with respect to parking and noise, and he doesn't want to increase the use of Mic Mac Park.

Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: M. 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):** AMEX PROPERTIES INC

**Subject Lands:** CON 7 N PT LOT 16 PLAN 1523;LOT 2 and known as Municipal Number 3915 BASELINE RD

**Zoning:** RH

**RELIEF:** Construct a single unit dwelling with reduced minimum lot area and lot frontage.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by: M. Baki  
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

That file numbers A-039/24 and B-025/24, CON 7 N PT LOT 16 PLAN 1523;LOT 2; and known as Municipal Number 3915 BASELINE RD are concurrent and will be heard together

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**

Mrs. 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: 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):** AMEX PROPERTIES INC

**Subject Lands:** CON 7 N PT LOT 16 PLAN 1523;LOT 2; and known as Municipal Number 3915 BASELINE RD

**Zoning:** Hamlet Residential Zoning RH

**REQUEST:** The conveyance of part of the above described lands, said lands being more particularly designated as Part 2 on the draft reference plan attached, for the purpose of creating a new lot

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

**PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Moved by: M. Baki  
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

That file numbers A-039/24 and B-025/24, CON 7 N PT LOT 16 PLAN 1523;LOT 2; and known as Municipal Number 3915 BASELINE RD are concurrent and will be heard together

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**

Mrs. 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: F. 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):** 2832765 ONTARIO INC

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 1342 LOT 131 TO LOT 132 and known as Municipal Number 1609 TECUMSEH RD W

**Zoning:** Commercial CD2.2

**RELIEF:** Construct a multiple dwelling with minimum 8 units and minimum reduced parking area separation from an interior lot line.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Jackie Lassaline, 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. Lassaline confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Ms. Lassaline outlines that they would like Conditions I and II removed, as those conditions are with respect to gaining Site Plan Approval, and it shouldn't warrant this variance before them today. Ms. Lassaline provides a PowerPoint presentation to the committee and public with an overview of the property at the corner of Mark & Tecumseh Rd. W – as appendix "A" to the minutes.

Ms. Lassaline points out as the last moment, Enwin came and informed there required a setback from the road, and the resulting was 5 m and reexamine the parking was lost. In order to maintain compliance with the by-law, they didn't have enough space for the units, and they have brought it down more so to 8 units. She believes the Site Plan was contrary to what they By-law was providing. Extensive review has taken place, and the requirement of Site-Plan review is contrary to the Planning act, and she has asked to have those conditions removed. Mr. Cerasa outlines that at the corner is a day-light corner and asks for more information. Ms. Lassaline outlines it is for clear-site line to oncoming training. Mr. Cerasa asks will they be compensated to convey to the city. MR. Miceli outlines in the proposed conditions, there would be no compensation to him and his development. Mr. Miceli outlines his position and some concerns he had by taking the planning process with this development and the City of Windsor. He feels this intentional and there wasn't any information provided at such time, and he can't understand why administration didn't provide information within the 18-month review, brought forward to council. He outlines the conditions, and the council resolution outlines that the Site-Plan Officer be directed. The concern is he is not required to go to Site-Plan, and now he outlines the City is now expecting the Committee to impose these conditions. Mr. Miceli outlines he paid for a planning process, and an application fee, and numerous studies, and now a Minor Variance fee, that he feels shouldn't have happened if City Administration was given to him from day one, and he designed accordingly with site-specific information. He is asking for a refund for Committee of Adjustment application fees. Mr. Cerasa outlines that small investors need to be commended, and this is a roadblock, and he is in support of the refund for the application as this is a modified plan, and he feels this is a waste of time for the Committee of Adjustment. Mr. Gatti asks if administration was asked about the timeframe. Mr. Miceli says yes. Mr. Gatti asks what happens at Site-Plan. Mr. Miceli outlines that it is not required, he has already endured financial hard ship, with all negotiations, and he would like to not be held up any longer and proceed with this development. Mr. Balsamo asked why are there conditions imposed, if he has already done what is requested. Mr. Atkinson outlines he has been involved with this file, and the minimum density was approved by Council, and that is how conditions are imposed at Site=plan and recognize that the plans have changed, and it could have gone back to council, and not site-plan and a holding permission could have been in place. However, since this tool is not available, Administration expedited it thru the committee, and the conditions were council directed, and since Site-Plan is not required, the Committee has the authority to impose

conditions at this stage, and this is the only option. Mr. Atkinson outlined the report was reviewed by our legal department with these recommendations rather than going back to council. Mr. Cerasa wants the conditions removed and refund the application. Mr. Atkinson outlines the Committee can't refund the application fees.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: M. Baki to APPROVE with the conditions as stated.

Not supported.

Moved by: Mr. Cerasa  
Seconded by: Mr. Balsamo

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

Abstained: M. Baki

**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):** ANPUTHASAN CHANDRAGOPAL

**Subject Lands:** PLAN 558 LOTS 334 TO 336;PT LOT 333 PT BLK A;RP 12R20068 PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 2253 DOMINION BLVD

**Zoning:** Residential RD1.1

**RELIEF:** Requesting relief from maximum accessory building height and lot coverage of accessory buildings.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Anputhasan Chandragopal, 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.

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Chandragopal confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Cerasa ask why they need this variance. Mr. Chandragopal outlines that the height concerns were required by the Building Department, and it was suggested to ask for the variance.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: M. Baki

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):** 1953482 ONTARIO INC.

**Subject Lands:** SANDWICH EAST CON 6; PT LOT 14; RP 12R3579; PT PART 2 and known as Municipal Number 1885 PROVINCIAL RD

**Zoning:** Commercial CD4.1

**RELIEF:** Relief from Sign Bylaw 250-2004 Regulation 6.3.14 Sign Restrictions.

**INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Matthew Burpee, 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. Burpee confirms they are in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Balsamo asks for the purpose of pushing the sign back. Mr. Burpee outlines they are trying to push the sign further away from the entrance. Mr. Fediuk outlines the By-law requirements, and outlines as placed where it is at, it is in conformity, and it is where it is at. He outlined that this is the most intrusive area, and that over the past 2 years, the applicant has worked to have this where it needs to be. Mr. Cerasa outlines he experienced the same in the past, and with the road improvements, he knows the reason that is something that isn't necessary in his opinion.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Marco Savoni, - 1925-1935 Provincial Rd. He outlines the sign being proposed obstructs the view of his property, and he has been approached by 3<sup>rd</sup> property to erect signs, and it obstructs visibility. He outlines that the sign is very close to the building, and this is going to cause a major problem with future leases. He outlines that his sign will be missed on his property, and this may cause a "sign war". The Chair asks for administration to speak to the concerns. Mr. Fediuk outlines that this road in the bylaw allows billboard signs, and in this case, he does have the conflict of the sign, however there isn't a set by-law with distance. Mr. Contitti outlines the issues are intersections and residential, and we are trying to from a traffic safety, and visibility. Mr. Savoni, outlines this sign could be erected in the middle of the property, and why on the lot-line, for the relocation of egress or further to the opposite of the property. He feels the location will dramatically decrease the value of this location and impact his property. Mr. Fediuk, outlines that to move the sign further to the North of the property would create a site line issued with the controlled intersection and there are strict guidelines that must be before or after, and further north would create a safety hazard, and in between the egress would be problematic and require a 6m set back. Health and safety VS likes is what is measured here. Mr. Savoni asks if the intersection of legacy is going to be moved. Mr. Fediuk outlines that in the circulation Traffic Department was part of it, and it wasn't brought up as an issue. The height of the sign is going to be 29 feet at its highest, and 19ft at the base. Mr. Savoni outlines that the line of site will be obstructed, especially of those passing by to find the business, and it wouldn't be visible from one side of the street. Mr. Savoni asks if he as the option to erect a sign on his property line, and will have the same rights? The Agent can't confirm the By-law. Mr. Fediuk outlines that a billboard sign is required to be 3m from the property line, and if not, it requires a variance. Mr. Fediuk outlines that there is another clause with respect to building codes, and zoning, that may require a greater distance, that could override the by-law as well. The 30m line from an abutting property or pylon sign is what is being applied for here. Mr. Fediuk outlines that consultation would be required with the building department to find a suitable accommodation for the sign. Mr. Savoni feels this will have a negative impact for his property and he objects to the proposed.



Moved by: F. Cerasa

Seconded by: M. 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.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

A memo is received prior to the hearing, to Change of Conditions for application B-054/23.

Ammad Alvi, Applicant, outlines that after review and design of the approval B-054/23 by the Committee previously there were 5 Conditions imposed. Mr. Alvi after careful re-design and review with the Engineering Department and application for drive-way permit, has outlined after having the survey completed, the previous conditions outlined a shared driveway permit, however now they can accommodate 2 separate driveways and would like that condition removed or be changed to permit 2 separate driveways.

Moved By: J. Balsamo

Seconded By: F. Cerasa

**IT IS HEREBY DECIDED** that the amendment to the application with the removal of condition V.  
**BE GRANTED.**

Abstain: M. Baki

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

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

Moved by F. Cerasa,  
Seconded by J. Balsamo,

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Hearing held **June 26, 2023 BE ADOPTED.**

**CARRIED.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting accordingly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Dante Gatti, Acting-Chairperson

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer

APPENDIX “A” – Power Point Presentation

