



**CITY OF ORILLIA
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**

HEARING MINUTES

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

HEARING OF

June 22, 2026

The June hearing of the City of Orillia Committee of Adjustment was held on June 22, 2026 in-person in the Tudhope-McIntyre Boardroom with the following in attendance:

Kelly Smith (Chair)
Pete Bowen, Committee Member
Ian Gordon, Committee Member
Jill Lewis, Senior Planner
Lorrie Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer
Sue McCormick, Acting Secretary-Treasurer

1. Introduction by the Secretary-Treasurer

2. Opening of Hearing:

The hearing was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

3. Approval of Agenda:

**039-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That the Agenda for the June 22, 2026, be approved.

Carried

**040-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Pete Bownen**

That Notice of today's hearing was sufficiently given.

Carried

4. Notification of Pecuniary Interest:

None

5. Manner in which Notice was provided:

The Secretary-Treasurer described the Committee of Adjustment procedures for the Hearing.

6. Applications:

6.1 B04-26 - 16 First Street

In attendance: Craig Mathieson of Skelton, Brumwell, agent and the owner, Amarjat Thiara.

The Secretary-Treasurer read all correspondence received relative to the application.

Proposal:

The purpose of the proposed severance is to request a division of land to create three (3) new residential lots. The retained and severed lots are proposed to accommodate semi-detached dwellings

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Mathieson addressed the Committee. He reviewed the overall proposal being the 3 new lots proposed, and the Zoning and Official Plan policies in support of the application.

Mr. Mathieson indicated that as a result of public input and additional site inspections they received revised comments. He reviewed the initial comments that were received that recommended approval of the application. Mr. Mathieson indicated that they understand further technical matters need to be considered after staff's additional site inspections and a number of studies to be completed. The applicant recognizes that this will entail further conditions of consent and would like Committee to consider the application for consent is for lots that comply with zoning standards and are intended for permitted residential use.

Mr. Mathieson would appreciate meeting with City staff to review and understand the technical concerns and how those matters can be appropriately scoped and addressed through conditions of consent. He advised that they are agreeable to a deferral, however, ask that it not be open-ended and that a future date be identified at this meeting.

Comments from the Public:

Anne Waggoner of 20 First Street addressed the Committee. Ms. Waggoner advised she would like an evening in-person meeting for working people in the neighbourhood to be able to participate in the public hearing discussion on this application. She noted there is no definition of "Stable Neighbourhood" in the City's existing Official Plan and historically the subdivision only had 1-storey structures and now there are 2-storey structures in the neighbourhood and she has come to learn that the 70-year-old covenant is "no good" to stop multiple-storey dwellings from being constructed in their neighbourhood. She noted there is a specific "feel" and "atmosphere" to the neighbourhood.

Staff provided information on the current Official Plan and the draft new Official Plan with the proposed vision of growth in neighbourhoods. The reference to Stable Neighbourhood is a term similar to Employment Area. The reference to compatible is not necessarily just what is existing but supports different types of housing.

Ms. Waggoner advised she would welcome a maximum of 4 units on the lot if they were built like North Lake Subdivision and feels the developers are taking advantage of the by-law. She is also concerned about the evolution of 36/38 Goldie Drive which was supposed to be 2 units and is now 6 units. She indicated there is nowhere to put the snow in the winter on this development. There is nowhere to store the snow on the street due to the narrow roadway.

Ms. Waggoner indicated the Official Plan contains language about “enhancing” and “improving” neighbourhoods to make them better. Perhaps creating more housing is making it better, however, compatible in the Official Plan means complementary in scale and massing.

Ms. Waggoner indicated she had contacted Doug Ford’s office and the Premier’s personal assistant indicated that every municipality is free to identify their own areas for “intensification”. She spoke about each area in the City is so different and this particular neighbourhood is a stable neighbourhood that is perfect for additional dwelling units on an existing lot. She noted that there is no sidewalk on this portion of Laclie Street, so pedestrians walk along First Street. She is concerned that the street has no existing sidewalks and sidewalks should be in place on the street to support this kind of proposed development.

Ms. Waggoner further expressed concern about how the proposed development would stay within the maximum 11m building height. She expressed concern about in the winter where the new recycle bins would be located on a roadway with snow removal concerns. She questioned how the new recycle bins would fit in the driveways within the road allowance. She indicated that there is a “duck pond” in her backyard and water is pooling and collecting in her backyard from water coming from other areas of the subdivision. A further concern is about several healthy maple trees and boundary trees, and she wants to be assured that the trees on her property will not be compromised by the adjacent re-grading of the subject property at 16 First Street.

Ms. Waggoner stated concern about the developer paying cash-in-lieu of parkland instead of providing recreation space. She questioned where the children in the proposed development are going to play? She raised safety concerns about future children in the proposed development if there are no sidewalks on First Street.

Ms. Waggoner implored the City to navigate how intensification will impact Orillia and it must be good for citizens above all less and over and above the developer.

Stewart Thompson of 12 First Street indicated his concern about overland flow stormwater coming from the Jehovah’s Witness building on Laclie Street and expressed

concern that both 20 First Street and 12 First Street get inundated with stormwater in their backyards.

He indicated he wants the City's Operations crews to build an underground storm sewer on the municipal storm easement that is located on his property at 12 First Street. Mr. Thompson also expressed concern about the sub-drain on the subject property (16 First Street) which drains into the municipal storm easement located on his property at 12 First Street. He also expressed concern about a potential sanitary sewer backup occurring if more development were to take place on the street.

The applicant, Mr. Thiara, advised that he appreciates where the residents in the neighbourhood were coming from, and he understood that any new proposal would make the area residents anxious. He emphasized with the residents about their concerns for change in the neighbourhood. He stated that there is so much changing with government legislation and that he was unsure of what he was going to build.

Mr. Thiara stated he resides in a triplex, and he wants his tenants to also be able to park on-site rather than on the municipal road but the City driveway by-laws are restrictive. He expressed that the City has a goal of achieving a population growth of 50,000 people over the next 25 years and that he is not interested in developing 10 First Street because the lot depth isn't sufficient for supporting development.

Mr. Thiara noted that with the Federal Government changes, he is contemplating building to sell rather than rental and he stressed that he was just there for a severance. He expressed interest in providing the "missing middle" housing product in Orillia and stated that if he has to go through the Plan of Subdivision process, the regulatory burden of a Plan of Subdivision would be too much, and he would never develop because the burden would be too high.

Deb Hodgson of 65 Boundary Road stated there was a potential for 16 units which is "ridiculous" for the neighbourhood.

Adam Tyms of 49 Second Street inquired about where 16 units would be located on the subject property. He expressed concern about the development at 36/38 Goldie Drive where the ditch was backfilled and the development covers the property to the property lines. He expressed concern about vehicles parking on the street along Goldie Drive as a result of that development. He questioned what the plan for parking would be on each of the proposed lots.

Terry Richard of 39 Goldie Drive stated she lives across from the 6-plex at 36/38 Goldie Drive and when that property was being developed, they were told it would only be a 4-plex, but it turned out to be a 6-plex. She indicated that there are approximately 12 vehicles on this development and vehicles park on her lawn. She expressed concern that there were no trees and there was no room for parking on that development. She expressed concern that they pile snow on her property.

Ms. Richard said that this popular subdivision is not North Lake and this proposed development is not appropriate for her neighbourhood.

Leanore Wiancko at 11 First Street advised that when you drive down Cedar Island Road, a lot of dwellings are being built bigger. She warned about noise from generators during construction and expressed that she is very upset about the proposed development.

Angela Apa-Stanton at 20 Second Street advised she expressed concern about only dealing with the severance of the lots and not the eventual build on the proposed lots. She was of the opinion that there should be more information about the proposed construction on the future lots.

Ms. Apa-Stanton noted that she understands the need for intensification but expressed concern about no room for the new recycling bins on the future driveway at the road allowance as well as concern about snow removal on First Street and she expressed concerns about stormwater drainage in the neighbourhood. She wants to know from the applicant about what their intention is for construction on the proposed lots and what does he propose to build?

She expressed concern that this development was being compared to North Lake Village development because North Lake Village was built and modelled to be constructed for that level of development; whereas this existing neighbourhood was not.

Staff advised that the applicant could build up to 16 units. Four units each lot provided the parking can be supported on the property which would be 5 parking spaces on each lot. They would also have to meet the setbacks and coverage, maximum width of driveway, landscaping, and ensure proper snow removal. Committee can only approve the actual severance of the land with conditions.

Jackie Zardo, 61 Boundary Road, expressed concern with the number of units.

The applicant, Mr. Thiara, advised it was not his intent to build 16 units.

Terry Corless of 60 Goldie Drive stated the neighbourhood has lived through the fiasco at 36/38 Goldie Drive. She expressed concern that they built an Apartment Building. She expressed concern that what has happened on Goldie Street will happen on First Street. She expressed that the development on Goldie Drive is not affordable housing, and she indicated that rents in that development are \$2,600 to \$2,900 a month plus utilities. It is not affordable housing.

Ms. Corless expressed sympathy for property owners that live on either side of the 36/38 Goldie Drive development, and she questioned validity in whether there was actually 4 feet between the building and property line. She said the development at 36/38 Goldie Drive was a “sneak”. She stressed that the development that took place at 36/38 Goldie Drive was a “fiasco”. She expressed concern about the parking of vehicles on this

development site, and she is very concerned about this proposed development at 16 First Street after what took place at 36/38 Goldie Drive.

Ms. Corless expressed concern that First Street's roadway is very narrow and again expressed concerns with snow removal on the roadway in the winter. She expressed concern with the amount of snow Orillia has been receiving during its winters. She questioned the total number of units to be constructed, and she stated that she had lived on Goldie Drive since 1982. She questioned how many units could be joined together?

Staff advised that a semi-detached structure is attached and separated by a lot line. Should 4 units be proposed they will have to meet the parking requirements. Setbacks to side lot lines are 4 feet with a 10% reduction through Bill 17.

Comments from Departments/Agencies

Engineering has several conditions proposed.

Staff Report

Planning Division recommends deferral of the application.

Committee Comments:

A Committee Member asked the applicant if he will retain ownership or rent out the units. Mr. Thiara advised he will be retaining ownership. The Member asked how the property will be managed and whether there will be different property managers for each lot. One item will be the location of the garbage bins.

Mr. Thiara advised he has looked into smaller bins and possible accommodation for the bins. He understands the importance of property management which will also ensure the snow removal on the property.

Mr. Thiara advised that is aware of the concerns raised by the residents and he is on the same page with respect to management of issues. His concern is with the Planning Act. He confirmed that he will own all 4 buildings.

A Committee Member asked about an additional water easement to the north and south upgrade to the ponding. Staff advised that the Engineering Division would need to speak about these issues.

A Committee Member asked for clarification of the height of the building. Staff advised that it is 11 metres to the midpoint between the eave and the peak and is taken from the grade at the front of the building.

A Committee Member asked how the Geotechnical Report and Hydrogeological Report will impact the total number of units. Staff advised that, dependent on the ground water

levels, the structures may not support having basements. A Committee member clarified that this would likely affect having only three dwelling units instead of four.

A Committee Member asked about the difference between a Plan of Subdivision and a Consent process. Staff advised that by way of Consent, City Divisions would review the required reports, and the applicant will have 2 years to complete the conditions. Under a Plan of Subdivision, all of the studies and reports are to be submitted for review prior to the application going before Council.

Staff advised further time is required to consider their recommendation.

Staff advised if Committee considers a deferral, the matter should come back no later than the end of December 2026 to be heard before the same members of Committee as it is an election year.

Mr. Thiara advised he had concern with an open-ended date to December and would like the matter to come back in August.

The Applicant's Planner stated that they would like to meet with City staff to address their concerns and to come up with scoped conditions of consent.

**041-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That Application B04-26 – 16 First Street be deferred subject to the reasons prepared by staff to no later than October 1st with an in-person hearing in the evening between the hours of 4:30 pm. and 7:30 p.m.

Carried

**042-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That the Reasons for Deferral are as follows:

1. Notwithstanding the recommendation in the original staff report dated May 12, 2026, public comments prompted staff to conduct further site visits (May 28 and June 11) and investigation regarding the proposed development.
2. Staff would like to hear the concerns raised by neighbouring owners at the June 22nd public hearing and have time to consider them after the hearing.
3. Additional conditions may be required to protect both the neighbourhood and the future residents of the subject property from adverse impacts. Staff will require more time to research and draft suitable conditions.
4. The number and complexity of the conditions ultimately developed may be of a nature more suited to a plan of subdivision than a Consent. Section 53(1) of the *Planning Act* states that the Consent approval authority "may give a consent if satisfied that a plan of subdivision of the land is not necessary for the proper and

orderly development of the municipality". At the time of writing the supplementary memo, staff was still evaluating whether a Plan of Subdivision is required to provide proper and orderly development as set out the City's Official Plan Consent Policy 7.1.12.1 a) given the number of plans and studies likely to be required to ensure the proposed development results in good land use planning.

Carried

7. Correspondence/Other Business:

None

8. Adjournment:

**043-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

We now adjourn at 11:11 a.m.

Carried

The Committee will reconvene at 9:15 a.m. on August 19, 2026.



Kelly Smith, Chair



Lorrie Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer