

Minutes of Committee Of Adjustment
August, 13, 2020

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Council Chambers

Meeting # 06

Present: Alan Revill, Mike Nolan, Ray Leonard, Tom Bruce, Norm Roberts, Ken Gee, Randy Ruttan & Mike Howe

Staff: Anna Geladi, Planner, Christine Woods, Planner, Claire Dodds, Director of Development Services and Michelle Hannah, Planning Assistant.

1 Electronic Meeting Information

- a) Due to technical difficulties, the meeting was not livestreamed on Facebook. The link to the recording can be found here:

https://www.southfrontenac.net/en/living-here/resources/GMT20200813-230628_Committee-_1920x1080.mp4

- b) During the meeting staff followed along with a presentation, the document can be found in the Agenda for this meeting as well as in the recording linked above.

2 Call to Order

3 Adoption of Agenda

- a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-2

Moved by Ken Gee Seconded by Norm Roberts

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby adopts the agenda for the August 13, 2020 Committee of Adjustment meeting.

Carried

4 Declaration of pecuniary interest

5 Approval of Minutes – July 9, 2020

- a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-3

Moved by Tom Bruce Seconded by Ray Leonard

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves the minutes of the July 9, 2020 meeting of the Committee.

Carried

6 New Minor Variance Applications:

- a) MV-45-19-P (George)

Location of Property: Part Lot 9, Concession 11, District of Portland, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 4235 Maple Drive, Verona Rock Lake

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of an accessory building (detached garage) within the projected front yard of the subject property located at a reduced setback from the highwater mark from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 18.5 metres (60 feet). The applicant is also seeking permission to increase the permitted maximum height of an accessory building from 6 metres (19.7 feet) to 7.4 metres (24.2 feet). The applicant is seeking relief from Sections 5.8.2, 5.24.2 and 14.3.2 of the Township of South Frontenac Zoning By-Law 2003-75 for the property located in the Urban Residential First Density (UR1) Zone.

Randy Ruttan advised that he received a telephone call from a constituent that advised the Committee of Adjustment is not live on Facebook.

The Planner delivered her report to the committee.

R. Leonard - advised he sees no issues with the placement of the garage, and with respect to the septic system, did anyone get any record of it failing or why do they not have a record and he does not think that this should be a condition of the Minor Variance as it has absolutely nothing to do with the location of the garage or a tie in to the septic system.

The Planner advised that there is no knowledge of the septic system failing currently or in the past, and the applicant has more information about the property and the septic that he may be able to speak to.

T. Bruce advised that he does agree that this placement is the best spot for the garage and wonders if there has ever been an inspection completed on the septic system, would be his only concern.

M. Nolan - curious that the recommendation from KFL&A Public health was that the committee would have the septic system as part of the minor variance and there is no recommendation for that in the Planning Report, so how was it that the planning department came to the conclusion to not have this recommendation included?

The Planner advised that Planning staff reviewed planning policies and documents including the Official Plan, Zoning By-Law and Planning Act, and the Township Official Plan Section 6.10.4 states that in the event of a failure of an existing septic system, the Township, in accordance with the Ontario Building Code, shall require the owner to construct a new system in accordance with current regulations. However, if there is no failure of the septic there was nothing found that said staff could recommend that it be replaced or upgraded. However, in the Planning Act, staff found that the Committee of Adjustment does have that power to include as a condition, if they see it necessary.

K. Gee advised that due to the proximity of the system to the water and the age, it should be upgraded.

M. Nolan is curious to know if it failed or not.

The Planner advised it would be hard to know, and she is not a public health expert, but there have been public health inspectors out to the property. It is her belief that the applicant does intend to upgrade the septic system at some point and if it does fail. She does not have the knowledge to know how to advise if it did fail.

C. Dodds advised the property owner is on the line to speak and she is unmuting him to allow him to speak.

Tyler George, the applicant, advised that he had Pete McNichols and Adam Heska, two local septic installers out to the property, they advised that the septic was fine. The applicant advised that he has no immediate plans to upgrade the septic, but if he did fail, he would do so.

Alan Revill and Claire Dodds advised that the Committee and staff were unable to hear Mr. George.

Tyler George advised again that the two septic installers were on site, and they see no problem with the current septic and he has no problem upgrading if and when it does fail, but it is not something he had planned to do immediately and not money he had set aside. He has been trying to building this garage for two years, and obvious the tile bed would be money that he was not prepared to spend.

K. Gee - can the applicant provide any information with respect to when the last time the septic system was pumped or services?

Tyler George advised that it was pumped last year by Orser septic.

Resolution No. 2013-14-4

Moved by Mike Nolan Seconded by Ray Leonard

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-45-19-P by Tyler George, located at Part Lot 9, Concession 11, District of Portland, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 4235 Maple Drive, Verona Rock Lake, to permit the construction of an accessory building, being a detached garage having dimensions of 6.1 metres x 9.1 metres (20 feet by 30 feet) with a setback from the highwater mark of 18.5 metres (60 feet) in the projected front yard of an Urban Residential First Density property (UR1) with an increased height of 7.4 metres (24.2 feet), subject to conditions.

Carried

b) MV-02-20-L (Vanderhaar)

Location of Property: Part Lot 23, Concession 13, District of Loughborough, Township of South Frontenac, Twin Island Lane, Buck Lake

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of a one-storey seasonal dwelling with a walkout basement located at a reduced rear yard setback from 10 metres (32.8 feet) to 6.5 metres (21.3 feet) and to increase the permitted lot coverage from 5% to 9.5%. The applicant is seeking relief from section 10.3.1 of the Township of South Frontenac Zoning By-Law 2003-75 for a property located in the Limited Services Residential - Waterfront Zone.

The Senior Planner delivered her report to the committee.

The Chair asked if the applicant could hear the committee members and staff.

Claire Dodds advised that she had a message from the applicants and they could hear, she has them on the line and will un-mute them so they can speak if they wish.

Amanda Vanderhaar advised that she grew up in South Frontenac and she wants to advise the committee members as to how much she and her husband want their three children to grown up in South Frontenac and to show them what Buck Lake and the Frontenacs have to offer. Thank you for taking the time to visit the lot if you were able, and you would have a much better understand of what complications the lot presents. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that they would first like to speak about precedents. On June 11th Committee voted on a property on Buck Lake that had 16.1% lot coverage and had 6 variance requests. These requests were deemed minor and this application was approved. The Vanderhaars advised they are asking for two variances, a 9.5% lot coverage and a rear yard setback which ensures compliance with the 30 metre water setback. During the process they have been advised that precedents do not matter and applications like the aforementioned are not considered, however, they have now been advised that their application is at risk of being denied because of fear precedents will be created. If past rulings don't take precedence, the Township should not be concerned about the approval of this application and how it would be considered for future

applications. Ms. Vanderhaar advised they began this process in September, 2019. The preliminary meeting advised the process would be swift and the proposal looked good, and since they were not proposing any accessory buildings they were advised they should move forward with their plan. The Vanderhaars advised they waited to submit their application until February since they were confident that would provide plenty of time to build in the spring. During several reports, telephone calls and emails, they were advised that the proposed location of the septic was a concern. In February Cataraqui Conservation and MECP both recommended swapping the septic location with the dwelling. There was no mention of lot coverage at that time. In April, during a conference call with Planning staff they were advised that if the septic were moved they would be more in favour of approval, even with the 9.5% lot coverage. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that they basically indicated that if the septic was move 9.5% lot coverage would be okay. Ms. Vanderhaar noted that during a site visit with the septic designer and Public Health planning reiterated that if the septic was moved they would be more in favour of approval. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that in May MECP again recommended swapping the locations, but no mention of the lot coverage concerns was made. On May 24th, considering the advice received, the Vanderhaars submitted a revised plan moving the septic and dwelling to the rear of the lot. Ms. Vanderhaar quoted an email that was received following this submitted proposal saying "the Township is very pleased with the revised proposal you have provided. Obtaining the 30 metre setback from the highwater mark to septic, this is a really great achievement on this property." Ms. Vanderhaar noted that, again, there was no mention of lot coverage. Ms. Vanderhaar noted that on June 24th, they submitted another revised proposal with the updated septic location, they were eager and hopeful they were meeting all of the requirements and concerns. An updated Environmental letter in support of the new locations was also submitted. Ms. Vanderhaar noted on July 9th, Council decided to defer their decision to allow for site visits. Ms. Vanderhaar said that last Thursday was the first time that it was recommended by planning to consider a zoning change, in the 11th month process again citing precedents as their concern. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that now that they had met the requirements of septic, it seems that the concerns have shifted and they have now learned they the Township staff are worried about the applicants or future owners ability to apply for another 5% lot coverage for accessory structures, increasing lot coverage. Ms. Vanderhaar noted that due to existing lot constraints, the current applicants or future owners would be required to apply for a Minor Variance present the application to the same committee, CRCA and MECP who would be fully within their rights to review and deny that application based on existing lot coverage, if they so choose. Ms. Vanderhaar stated that they are asking for two variances and they believe that their application, is in fact, minor. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that for those who have been to the location and viewed the proposal, she believes that the visit will have satisfied any concerns about the location of the cottage, and they will agree that the cottage is, in fact, desirable for the development of the lands. Additionally, zoning allows 5% for main buildings and an additional 5% for accessory buildings on lots that are supposed to be at least one hectare, which would work out to a house footprint of 500 square metres. Ms. Vanderhaar advised that their lot is much smaller and they are proposing a house that is less than the combined 10% lot coverage allowed by the by-law, meaning, if they proposed the cottage and deck separately, they would be 0.5% under what is allowable. Ms. Vanderhaar requested that the committee add a clause requiring a development agreement prohibiting construction of any accessory structures and registered on title, which should easily satisfy any concerns about the intent of the by-law. Since the concern of a new application for an accessory building seems now to be the main reason stated for supporting a Zoning By-Law Amendment, then it stands to reason that a Development Agreement should be acceptable. The Vanderhaars wished to reiterate that they are proposing to build a small cottage of only 1,168 square feet and they are requesting that the Committee take into consideration the proposal plus all of the time put into this process. The Vanderhaars feel that the cottage is an excellent addition to Twin Island

Lane and are hopeful that the Committee will assess the proposal based on their own experiences, visit to the property, process and its complications and the various conflicting advice they have received over the last 11 months. The Planning report is merely a recommendation and this decision is ultimately one that the Committee holds, they are hopeful to move forward with their dream to have a cottage on Buck Lake and they are hopeful the Committee moves forward to make a decision to approve the application with a clause for a Development Agreement which the applicants feel satisfies the concerns of the planning department in full.

M Howe advised he had some concerns with the application and being new to the committee there were some things that he does not understand, but then with the comments from the Conservation Authority it seemed like a big red flag as they had concerns about the trout lake and the whole sensitivity of it and the size of the development from 5% to 9.5% is a major variance, particularly on such a sensitive lake that we are speaking about. M. Howe advised that he does feel badly for the applicants, but he must support the planning staff, this is not a minor variance and he is not sure how to proceed, but a Minor Variance is not the way to do it.

R Ruttan advised that he is very conscious of the sensitivity of Buck Lake as he resides on the lake. He is also sympathetic to the applicants, and there have been several things they have tried to do to make the application work, the least of which is dealing with a number of different staff. R. Ruttan also advised that he supports planning staff, they are great staff and they make good decisions. However, he would like to support this application with caveats and several conditions, such as no further development. R Ruttan also advised that it is unfair that we seem to treat buildings that already exist different from buildings proposed, and he understands that something proposed now is being built better. R Ruttan does not feel that this is equitable and at the last meeting the committee approved a proposal for a significant lot coverage which he removed himself from the application, he had a lot of trouble with that. These applicants have done everything the Township staff have asked of them, they are trying to jump through hoops and at the end they are facing road blocks. R Ruttan advised that he would like to support this application, but he would also like to send it back to them as a deferral to work to get a smaller footprint with the septic that has been approved, and get that new approval approved by the Cataraqui Conservation staff because he believes it is necessary to have that to move forward with that.

A Revill advised that one of the issues that came up was if the decks were removed, they may be later added as an accessory structure, and in his opinion that would not be allowed as if the decks are attached or accessible by the main building, they are part of that main building and would not be considered as accessory and would not change the overall lot coverage. One of the questions he has for staff is if there was a wish to approve this by the committee, is there a way through a development agreement through this process to restrict the further development of the lot by accessory structures, since an applicant could come forward with an application to apply for an accessory structure within 5% of the lot coverage and the building department would be bound to grant it, since it meets the requirements of the Zoning By-Law. So the question to staff is, could a development agreement prohibit this?

C. Woods advised that a development agreement is not a way to prohibit development, because as the Chair mentioned a land owner could apply for a minor variance and the reason why staff are recommending a Zoning By-Law amendment to a site specific zone is to prohibit further development on the property over what is proposed, that is the only way to do that.

R Ruttan asked if there is room to ask the applicants to defer the application one more time to see if it can be amended to get it right for everyone to be

agreeable. He does not want to deny the application and then have them apply for a zoning by-law amendment to not have it supported and then be in the same position as they are facing now. Is there a way for them to move forward with some assurance that a zoning by-law will be supported?

M. Nolan asked if the motion is to deny the application and the committee votes no to the motion, what does that mean? And if the committee were to change the motion what would that look like?

A Revill advised that it would just be changing the motion from deny to defer or approve. He also advised that certainly, there is no guarantee that the Zoning Amendment would be approved, because it will be before Council.

M. Nolan thinks that deferring the application will only cause more frustration, but when you get into negotiations, time can have the effect of bringing about a solution. He advised that he knows Buck Lake fairly well and when he went to visit the lot, it is a tight lot on a tight lane and he had difficulties turning his truck around and he feels like development encroaching on the lane will add to this. They are going to have trouble with the lane, and there is no requirement to improve the lane. M. Nolan also advised that there are several examples of development on lakes that no one has any knowledge of when they happened or how. A great way to manage our sensitive lakes is by ensuring development that we can control conforms to the Zoning By-Law.

C. Woods advised that as staff are recommending a Zoning By-Law amendment if the application is denied, staff would support that application. Staff have also reached out to Cataraqui Conservation to gauge their perspective, and they indicated that a re-zoning that prohibits any further development on the lot could satisfy their concerns about development on the lot and on the lake.

A. Vanderhaar wanted to put numbers into perspective, 5% lot coverage is 867 square feet with all decks included. What they are proposing is not a huge structure and go in and be different than all other structures on the lane. They think it is a valid point and something for the Committee to consider.

B Vanderhaar added that although with the current zoning, they are within their rights to apply for an accessory building, where the house sits on the lot, there is no where to put anything in the rear or side yards and to get an accessory building they would be required to go through the Minor Variance again, and they are not sure if the Township is allowed to register a Development Agreement on title, they are willing to do so and they have no desire to build anything on this lot.

K Gee asked for a little more information with respect to the re-zoning.

C Woods advised that the process for re-zoning is similar to a minor variance process, there is a circulation to land owners within 120 metres of the property and notice would be given to the public, there would be a public meeting as part of a Council meeting and then Council would vote on the application. The tests for a zoning by-law amendment are different from the tests of a Minor Variance, where a Minor Variance has 4 tests, intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law and whether a Minor Variance is the right way to develop land and whether it is minor, a Zoning By-law amendment, the test is does it meet the intent and purpose of the Official Plan, that is the difference between them. And the zoning allows the township to restrict what is allowed on the property, whereas a Minor Variance is allowing a small change or a big change to different provisions or the Zoning By-law but it leaves everything else in place. That is why, if there was an application for an accessory building or to enlarge the deck on the cottage, that is something that is not prohibited through the variance process.

K Gee - presently it is zoning Limited Services Residential Waterfront, what would it be if it was changed.

C Woods - it would be a site specific Limited Service Residential Waterfront zone that would say it is a maximum 9.5% lot coverage with a reduced rear yard setback and will prohibit accessory buildings.

Resolution No. 2013-14-5

Moved by Randy Ruttan Seconded by Mike Howe

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby denies Minor Variance Application MV-02-20-L by Brad & Amanda Vanderhaar, located at Part Lot 23, Concession 13, District of Loughborough, Township of South Frontenac, Twin Island Lane, Buck Lake to permit the construction of a dwelling with a minimum rear yard setback of 6.5 metres (21.3 feet) and a maximum lot coverage of 9.5% in the Limited Service Residential - Waterfront (RLSW) Zone.

Carried

c) MV-08-20-B (Bumstead)

Location of Property: Part Lot 1, Concession 12, Parts 10 to 12 on Plan 13R3809, District of Bedford, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 10 Barrett Lane, Buck Lake

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of a dwelling with a reduced setback from the highwater mark from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 15 metres (49.2 feet). The applicant is seeking relief from Sections 5.8.2 (a) and 8.3.3 of the Township of South Frontenac Zoning By-law 2003-75 for a property located in the Waterfront Residential (RW-16) Zone.

The Senior Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

M. Nolan advised he visited the site in July and he believes the application as submitted is the best solution as the application brings the building back from the water where the current building exists and it is not over the 5% of lot coverage. He fully supports the application as submitted with the conditions listed.

Ms. & Mr. Bumstead advised they were available for any questions and thanked the staff and committee for all of the help and support with the application thus far.

R. Darling advised that they have no further comments and they would like to thank everyone.

Resolution No. 2013-14-6

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Ken Gee

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves minor variance Application MV-08-20-B by Jeff & Mary Bumstead located at Part Lot 1, Concession 12, Parts 10 to 12 on Plan 13R3809, District of Bedford, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 10 Barrett Lane, Buck Lake to permit the construction of a single detached dwelling with attached deck with a maximum combined floor area of 114 square metres (1228 square feet) with a minimum setback of 15 metres (49.2 feet) from the highwater mark in the Residential Waterfront (RW) zone, subject to conditions.

Carried

d) MV-14-20-S (Maycock)

Location: Part Lot 1, Concession 10, Part Block A and Lot 38 on Plan 544, being Parts 42 & 44 on Plan 13R16884, District of Storrington, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 1103 Heron Lane, Loughborough Lake.

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of a porch and carport attached to the existing primary dwelling with a reduced highwater mark setback from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 20.4 metres (67 feet) as well as a reduced private lane / right-of-way setback from 5 metres (16.4 feet) to 4.3 metres (14 feet) and to permit an increase in allowable lot coverage from 5% to 7.4%. The applicant is seeking relief from Section 5.8.2 a) and 5.6.1 of the Township of South Frontenac Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 2003-75 for a property located in the Limited Services Residential - Waterfront (RLSW) Zone.

The Planner delivered her report to the committee.

N Roberts advised he visited the site and he has no issues.

K Gee advised he also visited the site and because of the constraints of the lot, there is nowhere else to put the proposed development and the Conservation Authority is supporting the application and there is going to be a site control plan and if that is followed, he has no objections.

Mr. Maycock advised he is available to answer questions, otherwise he appreciates approval subject to conditions.

Resolution No. 2013-14-7

Moved by Ray Leonard Seconded by Tom Bruce

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance MV-14-20-S by Andrew & Clare Maycock located at Part Lot 1, Concession 10, Part Block A and Lot 38 on Plan 544, being Parts 42 & 44 on Plan 13R16884, District of Storrington, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 1103 Heron Lane, Loughborough Lake to permit the construction of a carport with a maximum size of 35.2 square metres (378 square feet) and porch with a maximum size of 17.48 metres square (187.5 square feet) located a minimum of 20.4 metres (67 feet) from the highwater mark and a minimum of 4.3 metres (14 feet) setback from the private lane/ right-of-way having a permitted maximum lot coverage for the principal building of 7.4 % on a Limited Services Residential - Waterfront (RLSW) property, subject to conditions.

Carried

e) MV-18-20-P (McNeely)

Location of Property: Part of Lot 8, Concession 11, District of Portland, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 1124 Storms Lane, Verona Rock Lake

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of an accessory building, being a detached garage with a reduced highwater mark setback from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 16 metres (52.5 feet). The applicant is seeking relief from Sections 5.8.2 a) and 10.3.2 for a property located in the Limited Services Residential – Waterfront (RLSW) Zone.

The Senior Planner delivered her report to the committee.

R Leonard advised that he spoke to this one at the last meeting and now that Conservation is in favour, he has no problem with it.

T Bruce agrees with R Leonard.

J McNeely wanted to say thank you for everything and the process has been seamless and they appreciate being able to build the garage.

Resolution No. 2013-14-8

Moved by Mike Nolan Seconded by Tom Bruce

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance MV-18-20-P by Jim & Jen McNeely located at Part of Lot 8, Concession 11, District of Portland, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 1124 Storms Lane, Verona Rock Lake to permit the construction of an accessory building, being a detached garage with a maximum size of 67 square metres (720 square feet) with a minimum highwater mark setback of 16 metres (52.5 feet) located in the Limited Service Residential - Waterfront Zone, subject to conditions.

Carried

f) MV-20-20-S (Peacock)

Location of Property: Part of Lot 14, Concession 8, District of Storrington, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 4080 Hideaway Lane, Dog Lake

Purpose of Application: To permit construction of a single detached dwelling with a reduced highwater mark setback from 30 metres (98.4 feet) to 12.8 metres (42 feet) and to permit construction of a storage shed with a reduced highwater mark setback of 22.2 metres (73 feet). The applicant is seeking relief from sections 5.8.2 a), 10.3.1 and 10.3.2 of the Township of South Frontenac Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-75 for the property located in the Limited Services Residential – Waterfront (RLSW) Zone.

The Senior Planner delivered her report to the committee.

K Gee asked what the difference between the recommended and proposed conditions are.

C Woods the powerpoint is just a summary.

K Gee advised he did visit the site and does support the application, especially with the recommended conditions.

N Roberts advised he visited the site and asked if the new dwelling is going on the existing footprint.

C Woods advised that the majority of the cottage is going to be on the existing footprint, it will be the same shape but will be extended a bit but will not be going closer to the water.

K Peacock thanked the committee, he thinks it will fit in with other development on Dog Lake.

Resolution No. 2013-14-9

Moved by Ken Gee Seconded by Randy Ruttan

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-20-20-S by Kevin Peacock, located at Part of Lot 14, Concession 8, District of Storrington, Township of South Frontenac, municipally known as 4080 Hideaway Lane, Dog Lake to permit the construction of a single detached dwelling with an attached deck with a maximum size of 110.4 square metres (1,188 square feet) and 25.1 square metres (270 square feet) respectively having a minimum setback from the highwater mark of 14.3 metres (47 feet) and to permit the construction of a storage shed with a minimum setback from the highwater mark of 22.2 metres (73 feet) in the Limited Services Residential - Waterfront (RLSW) zone, subject to conditions.

Carried

g) MV-23-20-L (Soaft)

Location of Property: Part Lot 1, Concession 7, being Part 2 on Plan 13R7923, District of Loughborough, Township of South Frontenac municipally known as 3130 Freeman Road.

Purpose of Application: To permit the construction of an accessory building, being a detached garage in the projected front yard of a Rural property and to reduce the interior side yard setback from 3 metres (9.8 feet) to 1.5 metres (5 feet). The applicant is seeking relief from Sections 5.24.2 and 7.3.2 of the Township of South Frontenac Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-75 for the property located in the Rural (RU) Zone.

The Planner presented her report to the committee.

M Howe attended the property and it is straightforward and falls within the Minor Variance package and supports approval.

R Ruttan agrees with Mike - he sees no issue.

P Timan a neighbour of the applicant advised he is totally in favour, he boards on the North East and West of the property, the stake may have been removed inadvertently along the west of the property. His only request would be if the Township would be in favour of replacing the stake that was removed, he is in favour of the applicaiton.

T. Demming does not have much to add to the report and he does not see any issues and it does check all of the boxes for a Minor Variance, if there are any questions please go ahead and ask.

Resolution No. 2013-14-10

Moved by Mike Howe Seconded by Randy Ruttan

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-23-20-L by Andrew Soaft, located at Part Lot 1, Concession 7, being Part 2 on Plan 13R7923, District of Loughborough, Township of South Frontenac municipally known as 3130 Freeman Road to permit the construction of an accessory building, being a detached garage in the projected front yard of the subject property wioth a minimum side yard setback of 1.5 metres in the Rural (RU) Zone, subject to conditions.

Carried

7 Other Business

a) Delegated Authority Consents Granted - Report

The Planning Assistant delivered the report to the Committee.

8 Adjournment

a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-11

Moved by Ray Leonard Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the August 13, 2020 meeting of the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment is hereby adjourned at 8:45 p.m. to reconvene on Thursday, September 10, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

Alan Revill, Chair