



**CITY OF ORILLIA
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**

HEARING MINUTES

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

HEARING OF

June 17, 2026

The June hearing of the City of Orillia Committee of Adjustment was held on June 17, 2026 by virtual meeting with the following in attendance:

Kelly Smith (Chair)
Pete Bowen, Committee Member
Ian Gordon, Committee Member
Jill Lewis, Senior Planner
Jeff Duggan, Senior Planner
Ali Chapple, Senior Planner
Susan Votour, Intermediate 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 9:15 a.m.

3. Approval of Amendment to Agenda:

024-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
Seconded by: Ian Gordon

That the Agenda for the June 17, 2026, be approved with an amendment to deal with Application A08-26 – 365 MacIsaac Drive first on the Agenda and remove the following statement from the Agenda: “It has been determined that the holding of virtual Committee of Adjustment hearings do not cause any significant prejudice”.

Carried

025-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
Seconded by: Pete Bowen

That the Agenda for the June 17, 2026, be approved with an amendment.

Carried

4. Confirmation of Minutes of the May 20, 2026 Hearing:

026-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
Seconded by: Ian Gordon

That the Minutes of May 20, 2026 be approved.

Carried

5. Notification of Pecuniary Interest:

None

6. Manner in which Notice was provided:

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

7. Applications:

7.1 A08-26 - 365 MacIsaac Drive

In attendance: Sandy Stevenson, Owner

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

Proposal:

The purpose of the proposed variances is to request an increase in the Gross Floor Area of a Detached Accessory Structure from 68.0 m² to 87.4 m², a variance of 19.4 m² and an increase in the maximum number of Accessory Structures from three (3) to four (4).

Comments from the Public:

A letter of support has been received from both adjacent neighbours (367 and 363 MacIsaac Drive).

Comments from Departments/Agencies:

The Engineering Division has no comments or conditions.

Staff Report:

Planning Division recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

Sandy Stevenson advised he was available if Committee had any questions.

Public Comments (at hearing):

None

Committee Comments

A Committee member indicated that he agrees with the reasons for approval, and he attended the site and felt this would fit nicely into the neighborhood.

Mr. Stevenson questioned what a zoning certificate was, and staff advised it ensures zoning compliance with the new build.

**027-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Pete Bowen**

That Application A08-26 – 365 MacIsaac Drive be approved with conditions, as per the Decision.

Carried

**028-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Pete Bowen**

That the Reasons for Approval are as follows:

1. The proposal maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan as it is compatible with the surrounding residential uses, maintains the established neighbourhood character, and does not create adverse impacts;
2. The variances maintain the general intent and purpose of the City's Zoning By-law, as the size of the lot and distribution of existing accessory structures preserve the subordinate nature of the proposed garage and ensures compatibility with the surrounding residential context;
3. The variances are desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land, as the proposal represents a reasonable accessory residential use on a large lot that can accommodate the development while maintaining appropriate setbacks, low lot coverage, and compatibility with surrounding properties; and
4. The variances are minor in nature, as the proposal does not result in adverse impacts related to privacy, overlook, shadowing, visual dominance, or overdevelopment.

Carried

7.2 A06-26 - 75 Mississauga Street

Following circulation of the Notice of Hearing for Application A06-26, the Committee received a request to defer and to hold the hearing for Application A06-26 as in-person hearing instead of an electronic hearing.

The Planner provided a presentation in connection with the Statutory Powers Procedure Act

The form of Notice of Hearing for Committee of Adjustment applications that has been in use since the City first started holding electronic Committee of Adjustment hearings in 2020 during the COVID pandemic, contains the following statement:

“Any person or agency who believes an electronic hearing would cause them significant prejudice must submit their concerns in writing to the Secretary-Treasurer by noon seven calendar days prior to the virtual hearing after which the Committee may reschedule the matter as an oral hearing if satisfied of the prejudice.”

The reason that this statement is included in the Notice of Hearing is that Section 5.2(2) of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act* (which defines the Committee of Adjustment as a “tribunal”) stipulates that “the tribunal shall not hold an electronic hearing if a party satisfies the tribunal that holding an electronic rather than an oral hearing is likely to cause the party significant prejudice”. Note that “oral hearing” is defined in the SPPA as “a hearing at which the parties or their representatives attend before the tribunal in person”.

Comments from the Public:

Mr. Ron Johnson, a neighbouring property owner, addressed the Committee requesting an in-person hearing. Mr. Johnson advised he cannot use a computer well and feels this allows the public and the media to attend the hearing.

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

The Owner, Mr. Jeff Pitcher, advised that he thinks that it is important that everyone has a right to participate. In this regard, the City has provided access to the meeting for Mr. Johnson in the staff meeting room. He feels there is no significant prejudice with this type of attendance available to the public.

Mr. Pitcher advised that he feels that applications need to be heard in a timely fashion and that reasonable accommodation has been provided.

Committee Comments:

A Committee member noted that although not comfortable with technology, the public can attend City Hall, and staff can assist with participating in a zoom hearing.

A Committee member noted that we have had an in-person hearing which can also be done in this case.

**029-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That Application B06-26 – 75 Mississauga Street East deferral to an in-person meeting be denied.

Carried

Chair Kelly Smith did not support the Motion.

The Public Hearing for Application A06-26 - 75 Mississauga Street East commenced.

In attendance: Jeff Pitcher, Owner

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

Proposal:

The purpose of the proposed variances is to request two variances required to facilitate the reconstruction of a building in the Downtown area. The building proposed is a 4-storey, Mixed-Use Building with 5 ground floor commercial units and 10 residential dwelling units with no on-site parking. The variances are for a Sight Triangle to be occupied by the building as well as an increase to the Maximum Height of the Building.

Comments from the Public:

A letter of opposition and a letter of support have been received.

Comments from Departments/Agencies:

The Engineering Division has no comments or conditions.

Staff Report:

Planning Division recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Pitcher, the applicant for the minor variance, addressed the Committee and noted with respect to the recommended conditions to the northeast of the building, the building substantially occupied the full corner post and was existing at the time. The original design went right to the corner, and he would like this to occur with the new build.

Mr. Pitcher indicated his concerns with leaving an open area with an awning. Unfortunately, the corner is temporarily occupied by folks seeking shelter. He would like to expand the building to the corner.

Mr. Pitcher's 2nd comment is on the architectural conditions. The new building is almost identical in height to the old building that was there. They are able to achieve the 4 storeys by compressing the height. It was originally a 3-storey building with a roller rink. The heights of the floor were 14 feet each. The new precast concrete panels allow for smaller structural elements between each floor which allows for the 4th floor. The 1st floor is 12

feet and then each after, is 9 feet. This is for a 4-storey building which was originally 3 storey when compressed.

Mr. Pitcher feels that the architectural component on the 2nd storey would look unusual and he is proposing to put it above the 3rd storey at the window. It would be a delineation of colour or mouldings.

He is hoping to provide small business owners and artists with a professional establishment to grow their businesses in the downtown.

Public Comments (at hearing):

Nino Lauro of 11 Peter Street addressed the Committee with his concerns. His first concern is water mitigation and how the engineering will be done. The building faces a street and there is no back area to mitigate water, and the water gathers in the back of 11 Peter Street and neighbouring buildings coming from Peter Street.

Mr. Lauro disagrees with the height. The building is substantially higher than the previous building that was there. There is significant snow load from the west winds, and they will have to get engineering reports to deal with extra snow because of the height of the building. Who is going to remunerate for upgrades to their roof lines.

Mr. Lauro indicated he has not seen any reports on the foundation of the wall that he had to repair as he owns part of that and hopefully would like his concerns resolved.

Mr. Pitcher advised he appreciated Mr. Lauro's concerns. Any water mitigation will be done through their engineer and any water on the roof will go through the drain to the drain storm sewer with the City's approval.

With regard to the snow load, their engineering will see to accommodate that and also will ensure the foundation is adequately underpinned or supported and this will also be addressed at the building permit stage.

Mr. Lauro advised he is referring to the snow load on his building on Peter Street South. There should be an engineering report that will address this snow load because of the new wall. Mr. Pitcher advised that any issues will be addressed and will make sure things are done properly in that regard.

Ron Johnson advised that his concern is a 4-storey building which should be a 3-storey building to conform with to the Downtown area.

Committee Comments

A Committee member noted the redesign for a possible glass corner for the storefront which would provide a sightline in the corner for pedestrians.

This would be similar to a couple of other properties in the downtown. With regard to the building height, the member looked for clarification if the height and design were similar to the Royal Bank across the street and Huronia Trust Building. Based on the recommendation of the new Planning Documents to Council, would this be allowable

Staff advised that the Committee member was speaking about the new proposed Official Plan going to Council. Staff further advised the new Official Plan will not come into effect until the province approves it and all applications have to meet the current 2011 Official Plan.

Mr. Pitcher advised the height is comparable across from the Opera house and maybe a little shorter. The height of the building is almost identical to the building that was there which was 13.4 metres. They are asking for 15 metres for unforeseen engineering issues.

A Committee member asked if there are any added structures on the top of the building such as a mechanical room. Mr. Pitcher advised the HVAC will be in each unit and possibly a mechanical room which will not need a height allowance. There is a proposed elevator room in the basement, but this still has to be worked out with engineering.

Staff advised that under site plan approval based on the commercial and residential units, a screened mechanical room and staircases are exempt. On the neighbouring property and the blowing snow, we want to mitigate any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties and recommend implementing a condition that will require that the design of the building does not increase snow load onto the adjacent building.

A Committee member asked what the phrase “architectural articulation” means. Staff advised that the intent is to maintain the look and feel of the height on the main street while still permitting additional height. This could be as simple as moulding on the building or a different colour of the brick.

The Committee member noted concerns in the historic downtown and the rendering of the building and hopeful that the proponent can accommodate a historic downtown with brickwork or different colours. As far as the sight triangle, the Committee member noted he is not too concerned as traffic is slower in the downtown and there are lights at this intersection. Windows would help mitigate any concerns there and maybe some more architectural detailing would enhance the building.

A Committee member noted that the sidewalk is quite narrow and it would be best to have a glass corner.

A Committee member questioned the architectural articulation at the 3rd floor and has staff considered this on the 2nd floor and is it possible to amend condition to 2nd or 3rd.

Staff advised that through the Urban Design Guidelines the building needs to conform. In the current Official Plan, there is some flexibility and the Committee could amend the

condition from 2nd to 3rd floor should they wish. Committee looked at the neighbouring building.

A Committee member asked if it is at the top of the 2nd floor or the top of the 3rd floor? The current Official Plan states above the 2nd floor. The applicant is looking to start it at the 4th floor. Mr. Pitcher advised at the bottom of the 4th floor.

Mr. Pitcher advised that they could do mouldings between the 3rd and 4th floor or change the colour from the top of the 3rd floor up. Mr. Pitcher advised that the wording for snow load should say professional engineering should be satisfied that it does not put any unsafe snow loads on the neighbouring roofs. The Building Department will also be involved with this at the permit stage.

Mr. Lauro advised it is not just snow load. It is what the wall does with prevailing winds and loads up the snow and now it will be at his expense to mitigate any snow loads and what conditions the City can put in place for a dangerous snow load.

A Committee member questioned if the building is going to be the original height of previous building, will there be any additional snow build up?

Staff advised Committee could impose the condition that the engineer evaluate to ensure the snow load.

Mr. Lauro advised that the prevailing winds blow south to southwest right against the parapet that is there. There was a brick wall and shingle area, and the height is higher and snow builds up over a laneway. More snow loading there and he would have to pay an engineer as it becomes his responsibility as the owner. What is the City going to do in this regard?

Staff suggested a condition be imposed to deal with neighbour's concern and we want to ensure that no adverse impact imposed on the adjacent property as a result of this proposed development.

A Committee member questioned if the new building is not as high as the old building. Can the condition only be imposed if the height is proven to be higher.

Mr. Lauro advised that the wall itself was attached to the building before. The wall is new and there is an air space in between and more pressure on the wall. This needs to be determined not just only if the building is determined to be higher.

Committee recessed for 10 minutes.

Staff cannot confirm the height of the building before it burned down.

Mr. Pitcher advised he had a concern with the way the condition is worded that the proposed building does not increase snow load on the adjacent building, however, the

building will increase the snow load. The wording should be that an engineer can certify snow drift load is acceptable.

Mr. Lauro stated the engineer report should represent what snow load can be achieved on the roofs that are existing, not just the adjacent roof but all along the street. That wall is going to be substantially higher with a substantial snow load and stating to the satisfaction of the City is unacceptable. The City is going to state if unacceptable snow load, then the owner has to repair.

They are building something new beside the adjacent buildings that are older and this should be done properly.

Staff advised that conditions need to be reasonable and related to the request being made. The applicant cannot be asked to study and evaluate structural snow load of adjacent buildings. This is beyond the obligation and responsibility of the applicant. The applicant can only ensure the proposed building does not cause an increased snow load as a result of this proposed building. Staff is comfortable with the condition and Committee can defer this matter to consider the application.

Staff also advised a 4 storey is permitted under the Zoning By-law and were the applicant maintaining the height, the Committee would not be seeing this application. The applicant cannot be required to test the structural buildings surrounding the new building and there are some mitigation measures through the building permit.

Mr. Lauro advised that Mr. Pitcher has no obligation to the south of the building. We want everything done properly. When the snow load becomes an issue then what happens?

Committee can only deal with what is before them now under their authority.

Mr. Pitcher asked that in condition 3 to add the wording that “compared to previous height” and staff changed to “beyond what a building that conforms with the Zoning By-law would create”.

A Committee member noted Mr. Lauro’s valid concern and that he and the neighbouring owners clearing their roofs is prudent building maintenance and a building owner needs to take in consideration and monitor what the snow load is.

030-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
Seconded by: Pete Bowen

That Application A06-26 – 75 Mississauga Street be approved with conditions, as per the Decision.

Carried

**031-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That the Reasons for Approval are as follows:

1. The the proposal maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan with respect to the height of buildings in the “Historic Main Street” designation since the building is four storeys. Provided the recommended conditions are imposed, the building design will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the design policies of the “Historic Main Street” designation.
2. The variances maintain the intent and purpose of the City’s Zoning By-law because despite the additional height, the building remains at four storeys. With the imposition of the recommended condition regarding sight lines at the intersection, the intent of the Sight Triangle provisions in the Zoning By-law will be met.
3. Since the variances will allow a mixed-use building containing commercial and residential uses to be reconstructed on this prime vacant site in the City’s downtown, they can be considered desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land.
4. The variances are considered minor in nature since they will not cause any negative impacts on the surrounding properties.

Carried

7.3 A07- 26 – 135 Shannon Street

In attendance: Lauren Arsenault, agent on behalf of the Owner

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

Proposal:

1. To permit a 27.8m² Accessory Structure (or other Shoreline Structure) within Shoreline Buffer Overlay Zone (30m from Lake Simcoe), whereas the Zoning By-law permits Accessory Structure (other Shoreline Structure) no larger than 15m².
2. And to permit that 27.8m² Accessory Structure/Other Shoreline Structure 1.2m from a Side Lot Line, whereas the Zoning By-law requires 2.0m

Comments from the Public:

None

Comments from Departments/Agencies:

The Engineering Division has no comments or conditions.

Staff Report:

Planning Division recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

Lauren Arsenault of Morgan Planning & Development Inc. provided a presentation to the Committee.

Public Comments (at hearing):

None

Committee Comments

A Committee member noted that he attended at the site and this structure is certainly compatible with the neighbourhood, does not affect sight lines and will enhance the property.

032-26 **Moved by: Pete Bowen**
Seconded by: Ian Gordon

That Application A07-26 – 135 Shannon Street be approved with conditions, as per the Decision.

Carried

033-26 **Moved by: Pete Bowen**
Seconded by: Ian Gordon

That the Reasons for Approval are as follows:

1. The proposal maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan with respect to having little to no impact on the shoreline or waterbody of Lake Simcoe.
2. The variances maintain the intent and purpose of the City's Zoning By-law, as the proposed reduced setback and increased area of the structure continue to preserve its accessory nature and function.
3. The variances will allow the existing structure to remain in place and provide the owner with the opportunity to obtain the appropriate permits. The structure has been reviewed in its current, as-built condition and it does not cause adverse impacts on the property, existing structures, the shoreline, or adjacent properties.

It is therefore considered appropriate and desirable for the orderly development and use of the land.

4. The variances are considered minor in nature since they will not cause any negative impacts on the surrounding properties.

Carried

7.4 B05-26 – 39 Peter Street North and 31 Coldwater Street East

In attendance: Justin Lima, Dillon Consulting Limited, agent on behalf of the Owner

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

Proposal:

The purpose of the proposed of the proposed application requests the granting of an easement for pedestrian and vehicular access over a portion of the properties know municipally as 39 Peter Street North and 31 Coldwater Street East (the “Servient Tenement”) in favour of the property known municipally as 27 Peter Street North (the “Dominant Tenement”).

The primary purpose of the proposed easement is to allow access to the parking area and entrance at the rear of 27 Peter Street North, with a secondary purpose of allowing access to the north and west sides of the building for maintenance purposes. It should be noted that the easement would not include the right to park on the easement lands.

Comments from the Public:

None

Comments from Departments/Agencies:

The Engineering Division has no comments or conditions.

Staff Report:

Planning Division recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Owner/Applicant’s Comments:

Justin Lima of Dillon Consulting provided a presentation to the Committee.

Public Comments (at hearing):

None

Committee Comments

A Committee member questioned if a survey will be done to delineate the easement and staff advised this is a condition.

**034-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Pete Bowen**

That Application B05-26 – 39 Peter Street North and 31 Coldwater Street East be approved with conditions, as per the Decision.

Carried

**035-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That the Reasons for Approval are as follows:

1. The proposed Consent to grant an Easement is for legal purposes and does not offend any provincial or municipal planning policies.
2. The application conforms with the requirements of the City of Orillia Zoning By-law, the City of Orillia Official Plan and satisfies the requirements of all commenting agencies.

Carried

Committee took a recess until 11:31 a.m.

7.5 B02-26 and A03-26 – 353 Old Muskoka Road

In attendance: Connor McBride, agent on behalf of the Owners and Colby Marshall, Developer

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 four (4) new and one (1) retained residential lot(s) fronting onto Old Muskoka Road.

The applicant has requested the following variance being 1 parking space for each Dwelling Unit for a total of three parking spaces.

Comments from the Public:

Two letters of opposition have been received.

Comments from Departments/Agencies:

The Engineering Division has no comments or conditions.

Staff Report:

- Planning Division recommends approval of the consent application with conditions.
- Planning Division does not recommend approval of the minor variance application.

Owner/Applicant's Comments:

Connor McBride, agent for this application, provided a presentation to the Committee.

Public Comments (at hearing):

Deandra Holt, neighbouring property owner across from the property addressed the Committee. The proposed development has been going on for 2 years and the biggest concern is overdevelopment of this property. They have been lied to as to what is going to be developed and have been sitting with land not being cleaned up.

Ms. Holt advised that the fence has been put up inches from a driveway causing snow removal issues. The aging infrastructure can in no way support 16 units. There is a sewer line that has shifted so before anything gets built here is the City going to update the services. There are no sidewalks and this development does not fall within the Official Plan as it is not in character and there are no townhouses and the intensification development is at the end of the streets. Ms. Holt has no issues with 2 bungalows or 2 townhouses as long as there room for snow removable. There will be a parking issue.

Ms. Holt noted her concerns with overdevelopment of the lot. Certain properties in this area are subject to use by people for bathrooms and littering. Apartment type development puts people on top of each other which causes problems. Ms. Holt is concerned about whether these are going to be two-storey or three-storey homes and will cause drainage issues. They have water issues in the area and culvert fills already and all the trees have been removed. She has a concern that no pictures have been shown of what is proposed. During construction there are safety concerns.

A Committee member questioned if the infrastructure can be supported. Staff advised that Committee amend the conditions to require the applicant to provide a functional servicing report from an engineer, and they confirm sufficient capacity in the area or not. An additional condition would be to prepare a construction management plan to ensure no offsite neighbouring impact during construction.

Mr. McBride advised that with the servicing question, there is a condition that the applicant apply for lateral permits which exam the proposed development against the existing services available. This is also the kind of development under the Official Plan that is as

a right and would request that a functional servicing report not be required as the lateral servicing would look at the development.

Mardi McLaughlin advised that she is in agreement with what Ms. Holt has advised and she lives directly across from this site. Her concern is that with the reduction of parking, this does not change the number of cars that will be on the property. She has a concern that this will cause parking on the street and the school bus comes down to pick up the children living in the area.

Leslie Raymond advised she lives immediately across from the lot in question. Ms. Raymond concurs with all of the concerns and comments.

Ms. Raymond read a letter from Mary Martin and David Johnston, neighbouring property owners. This is a public safety issue. The assumption of each family only having one vehicle is false. Where are all these people going to park. The seniors walk in the area. This is a bus route. The children walk along the road. They have snow removal concerns and there will be storm water management issues with the open ditch storage capacity. This area has a high-water table, and construction will be slab on grade with no basements. The driveway could come off of Old Muskoka and move to Landon while removing the one driveway. This is contrary to the neighbourhood. There will be 3 families in each unit, and this proposal should be considered by Council which would require an OP amendment and Zoning change as well as site plan control. Please refuse this application.

Ms. Holt notes the sewer main is broken and no one has been back to repair. Lacie is an intensification area, and this is too much development in this area. Ms. Holt requested the Committee to deny the application.

Mr. McBride advised the development will follow the zoning by-law and will be 3 storeys, slab on grade. There is a landscaping plan being completed and entrance analysis will address matters to the entrances.

Robert Beadle, neighbouring property owner, advised he is in agreement with all of the comments. One thing that has not been considered by City staff is that there is no reason this should not be dealt with by way of a plan of subdivision. The proponent has not lived up to the previous commitments, a species at risk analysis has not been taken, the proponent clear cut several mature trees plus on City property. The City buses fly down the street and school buses at the corner which are all safety concerns.

Mr. Beadle noted that the driveway at the back of the property is the only green space left and there are 4 conifer trees that are at risk. He would insist on a subdivision plan and there is no intent for sidewalks. The new green recycling bins will not fit on the property which further adds to the problems.

Committee Comments

A Committee member indicated concerns with several items such as the parking configuration with 3 parking spaces and the cars closest to the building trying to back out.

Mr. McBride advised that tandem parking is permitted with additional dwelling units and they had initially provided a double-wide driveway concept which would have partially mitigated but this was not supportable due to the frontage coverage requirements.

A Committee member questioned if each additional dwelling unit in the semi-detached is individually owned or rented out. Mr. McBride advised that each semi-detached will be individually owned and the additional dwelling units will be part of the semi and cannot be sold separately. Lots 1 through 4 could have separate owners and through the consent they can be sold. The member's concern is with the standard maintenance of the property such as snow removal and the wooden fence that will ultimately need to be repaired, and each owner may not assist.

Mr. McBride noted there is a privacy fence to be installed. Property standards would be applied for the snow removal on each lot. There are areas in the rear yard as well.

A Committee member sees major issues and does not feel this application meets the character of the neighbourhood and over intensification and will not be supporting the application.

Ms. Holt noted that the fence has been installed and impacting the neighbour and it is very close to the neighbour's driveway.

Mr. Beadle advised that the fence is not built to standard with concrete footings. Just wooden posts and we should worry about longevity of these fences.

Chris McLaughlin lives across the road from the property. There are a lot of questions, and this property is being overdeveloped with questions on safety issues, school buses and snow issues. The snow piles a lot on the road so backing out on the street from the new driveways will impact everyone's sightlines.

A Committee member asked for clarification on what is proposed.

Semi-Detached – 1 primary and 2 ADUs – total 3

Single Detached with a Primary and 3 ADUs – total 4

The application was originally approved 2 years ago, and it was one owner and one additional unit.

Mr. McBride advised that the Zoning By-law allows three additional dwelling units in a single detached and a semi-detached dwelling.

Mr. Colby Marshall advised that previous approval was for 5 lots with 3 units per lot for a total of 15. The By-law changed during the severance timeline and are now allowed to do 4 dwelling units.

Staff advised that from hearing the public with the capacity and construction management, Committee could impose a functional servicing report which is very different from the sewer and water laterals. Committee could also deem if this proposal goes through a plan of subdivision rather than by way of severance.

Staff are satisfied that all of the conditions can be met and are recommending a functional servicing report to confirm capacity and a construction mitigation report to ensure no negative impact to construction.

A Committee member asked if we follow the recommendation of approval of consent and deny the minor variance, shouldn't the parking be resolved and then make the decision the whole development goes forward.

Staff advised that if Committee deny the parking request it means that fewer units can be developed on the lot. Committee is being asked to make one decision to create these four lots or should this go before Council as a plan of subdivision.

Mr. McBride advised he agrees with 2 fundamental parts to the decisions and if Committee agrees to deny the variance, then the consent is still recommended for approval.

Ms. Raymond asked, in the interim, that the owner clean up the property while this is getting resolved with the grass and 4 piles of mixed fill and quite an eye sore.

Staff advised that any member could file a complaint on the City's website and By-law can inspect under the Clean and Clear By-law. This is not to be adjudicated by the Committee today

Ms. Holt advised that originally as townhouses only and not additional lots and 2 parking spots at that time. A Committee member advised that they can only deal with what is before them at this meeting.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if it is possible to see what the original approval was and see the buildings proposed as this is a different proposal.

A Committee member noted that they are looking to create four new lots and the parking relief.

A Committee member asked if the buildings were redesigned to put the parking in the garage for a total of 4 units, could they still be in tandem. Staff advised that yes 4 parking spaces can be tandem. A garage space has to be 3.3 metres for newer garages exceeding the size of the parking space.

A Committee member asked what size units are being constructed. Mr. Marshall indicated different designs up to 2 bedrooms.

A Committee member asked how we deal with the applications being A03-26 first on the parking. Staff advised that these are 2 separate and distinct matters and can consider the minor variance or consent first. A Committee member would like to deal with the parking variance first.

A Committee member advised he appreciates the five lots but is concerned about how they are going to be used and this needs to be determined.

Ms. Raymond noted that she is not opposed to the development of the property but just opposed to what the development is going to be. There are no 3-storey buildings on their street and a concern with the volume of people.

**036-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Pete Bowen**

That Application A03-26 – 353 Old Muskoka Road be denied.

Carried

**037-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

Reasons for Denial of Minor Variance A03-26 from Planning Report:

- **There is a lack of alternative parking supply in the surrounding area (i.e. there are no municipal parking lots);**
- **The intent of the Zoning By-law is not met as there is an inadequate supply of parking for the proposed land uses; and**
- **The requested variance is not appropriate for the orderly development of the land given the potential for adverse impacts on the municipality for having to conduct parking enforcement.**

Committee recessed to 12:43 a.m.

**038-26 Moved by: Pete Bowen
 Seconded by: Ian Gordon**

That Application B02-26 – 353 Old Muskoka Road be approved with conditions, as per the Decision.

Carried

Committee Member Bowen did not support the Motion to approve Consent B02-26 as noted in point two of the Reasons for Approval.

**039-26 Moved by: Ian Gordon
 Seconded by: Kelly Smith**

That the Reasons for Approval of Consent B02-26 are as follows:

- The proposal is consistent with the direction by the Province in the PPS, 2024 to support infill and intensification and expanding the range of housing types within an existing neighbourhood on municipal services;
- The proposed lot creation conforms to the City's Official Plan Consent policies provided that the recommended conditions of approval are implemented to the City's satisfaction;
- Compliant with the Zoning By-law's minimum lot area and lot frontage requirements for the creation of new lots with Single Detached Dwellings and Semi-Detached Dwellings in the Residential Two (R2) Zone; and
- A Plan of Subdivision is not required for the proper and orderly development provided all of the recommended conditions of approval are implemented to the City's satisfaction.

Carried

8. Correspondence/Other Business:

None

9. Adjournment:

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

We now adjourn at 12:51 p.m.

Carried

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



Kelly Smith, Chair



Lorrie Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer