

Minutes of Committee Of Adjustment  
February, 10, 2022

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Council Chambers/Virtual via Zoom

Meeting # 01

Present: Norm Roberts, Mike Nolan, Doug Morey, Mike Howe, Ken Gee, Alan Revill,  
Randy Ruttan

Absent: Tom Bruce

Staff: Christine Woods, Senior Planner, Anna Geladi, Planner, Michelle Hannah,  
Planning Assistant.

- 1 Call to Order
- 2 Adoption of Agenda
  - a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-2

Moved by Ken Gee Seconded by Allan Revill

THAT the South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby adopts the agenda  
for the February 10, 2022, Committee of Adjustment Meeting.

Carried

- 3 Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair
  - a) Appointment of Committee of Adjustment Chair

Nominations were called for a new Chair person.

Alan Revill nominated Randy Ruttan, Norm Roberts seconded the motion.  
Michelle asked if there were any further nominations for the position of Chair  
Person, Alan Revill moved that the nominations be closed, Norm Roberts  
seconded that motion.

Resolution No. 2013-14-3

Moved by Alan Revill Seconded by Norm Roberts

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby  
appoints  
Randy Ruttan in the position of Chairperson.

Carried

- b) Appointment of Committee of Adjustment Vice-Chair

Michelle called for nominations for Vice-Chair Person.

Norm Roberts nominated Alan Revill, Doug Morey seconded the nomination,  
Alan Revill accepted the nomination.

Resolution No. 2013-14-4

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the South Frontenac Township Committee of Adjustment hereby appoints  
Alan Revill in the position of Vice-Chairperson.

Carried

- 4 Electronic Meeting Information

- a) The meeting will be live streamed at the following link:  
<http://www.facebook.com/SouthFrontenacTwp/>

Please visit the Virtual Committee of Adjustment Meetings page on the Township website for the link to register to be a participant in this meeting:  
<https://www.southfrontenac.net/en/open-for-business/virtual-committee-of-adjustment-meetings.aspx>

Instructions about participating via Computer, Laptop, Smartphone, Tablet and Telephone can be found at the above noted link as well.

- b) PowerPoint Presentation Staff has prepared a PowerPoint Presentation that will be displayed on the screen of the meeting, you can also follow along with the PDF version that is in the attachment of this agenda item.

5 Declaration of pecuniary interest

6 Approval of Minutes – December 9, 2021

- a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-5

Moved by Alan Revill Seconded by Mike Howe

THAT the South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves the minutes for the December 9, 2021 Committee of Adjustment meeting.

Carried

7 Minor Variance Applications Previously Deferred

- a) MV-52-21-S (Foley)

**Location:** Vacant property on Pine Point Lane – Roll Assessment Number: 102907006025909

**Purpose of Application:** To vary section 10.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a dwelling to have a 27 metre setback from the high water mark and front yard, whereas a minimum 30 metre setback is required and to permit a setback of 0.8 metres from the interior side yard and road allowance whereas a minimum 3 metre side yard is required.

The Planner delivered her report to the committee.

Committee member Gee advised that he visited the site after it was marked out and that helped immensely, he agrees with the Planner, this is the best situation for the site.

Committee member Roberts advised that he also visited the site and saw it all staked out and it made much more sense and he agrees with the Planner.

Committee member Revill advised that he visited the site and he noted there were several challenges with this matter. He advised that seeing the site allowed him to be prepared to support the matter, he did note that he wanted the applicants to be aware, that although there is a Licence Agreement entered into with the Applicants and the Township for ;a driveway to be constructed over the unopened road allowance, the road allowance remains as open to the public and can be used by the public as access to the water. Committee member Revill also inquired with respect to the placement of the garage as it seems rather low, and asked if there is a watercourse that runs through that area.

The Planner advised that the watercourse, or low lying lands, being a drainage path is slightly north of where the garage is proposed.

Resolution No. 2013-14-6

Moved by Mike Howe Seconded by Alan Revill

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-52-21-S for a vacant property on Pine Point Lane, Storrington District, Roll number 1029-070-060-25909. To permit a single detached dwelling with an attached garage and attached deck having a total footprint of 272 square metres to have a minimum 27 metre setback from the high-water mark of Cranberry Lake and front lot line and a minimum 0.8 western interior side yard setback consistent with the revised drawings received on January 17, 2022, subject to conditions.

Carried

b) MV-56-21-P (Wehrle)

**Location:** 1121 Willy's Lane

**Purpose of Application:** To vary 10.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit seasonal dwelling with attached deck to have 10.5 metre setback from the highwater mark, whereas a minimum 30 metre setback is required.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Resolution No. 2013-14-7

Moved by Alan Revill Seconded by Mike Howe

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-56-21-P for the property municipally known as 1121 Willy's Lane, Fourteen Island Lake, Portland District. To permit a single detached dwelling with attached deck to be set back a minimum of 11.5 metre from the front lot line and to be setback a minimum 11.5 metres from the high-water mark of Fourteen Island Lake, as per the revised drawings received on January 26, 2022, subject to conditions.

Carried

8 New Minor Variance Applications:

a) MV-21-21-B (Jenne) (The Boulevard Group)

**Location:** 130 Oakshores Lane

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary sections 5.8.2 and 11.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a seasonal dwelling with attached covered porch to have 25 metre setback from the highwater mark, whereas a minimum 30 metre setback is required.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Nolan advised that he had visited the site and he agrees with the planning report.

Committee member Revill advised that he visited the site and he noted that in some instances it may be problematic to raise a structure to put a basement beneath it making the structure taller than all of those surrounding it, but in this case, the existing structure is much lower than those surrounding and will not obstruct views.

The Agent, Mr. Sands confirmed that he had reviewed the conditions and they have no objections, it was a positive process and the proposed development will be a benefit to the area.

Resolution No. 2013-14-8

Moved by Ken Gee Seconded by Alan Revill

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-21-21-B for the property municipally known as 130 Oakshores Lane, Bobs Lake, District of Bedford. To permit a single detached dwelling with an attached covered porch to establish a minimum 25 metre front yard setback and to be setback a minimum of 25 metres from the high-water mark of Bobs Lake. The dwelling is also permitted to have a basement and a 15 square metre addition as per the revised drawings submitted on December 17, 2021, subject to conditions.

Carried

b) MV-32-21-P (Rosebush Energies)

**Location:** 5589 Road 38, Hartington

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary section 19.3.2 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a canopy over the existing gas station to establish a front yard setback of 5 metres whereas the Zoning By-law requires a front yard setback of 15 metres for an automobile service station.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Gee inquired as to the height of the proposed canopy.

The agent, Mr. Burger advised that the height of the canopy is 18 feet from the ground to the underside of the proposed canopy.

Resolution No. 2013-14-9

Moved by Alan Revill Seconded by Mike Howe

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-32-21-P at the property municipally known as 5589 Road 38, District of Portland. To permit a fuel pump canopy over the existing gas station to be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the front lot line, as per the drawing received on November 20, 2021, subject to conditions.

Carried

c) MV-59-21-B (Mendes)

**Location:** 606 Old Thirteen Island Lake Road

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary section 5.8.2a) and 10.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a covered porch to be located 12.5 metres from the highwater mark whereas the Zoning By-law requires a 30 metres setback from the highwater mark.

This application also seeks relief from section 5.8.2a) and 10.3.2 of the Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a detached garage to be located 18 meters from the highwater mark and to have a maximum building height of 8.8 metres whereas the Zoning By-law requires a 30 metre setback from the highwater mark and a maximum height of 6 metres for accessory structures.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Revill asked about a condition with respect to roof runoff.

The Planner advised that staff have not recommended any conditions with respect to roof runoff, but if the Committee wishes to include a condition with respect to this, they are able to do so.

Committee member Revill advised he does not have any specific objections to the matter, but felt that it would appropriate to consider some relief from the runoff into the lake when it comes to the vote, he may propose an amendment.

Committee member Nolan advised he visited the site, and he does not have any issues with the roof over the deck, but the additional condition for roof runoff makes sense. Mr. Nolan inquired with respect to why the garage needs to be as large as it is proposed, the cottage is 700 square feet and the garage will be 840 square feet, two stories, approximately 34% bigger than the building currently on the property. Mr. Nolan advised that he believes that this building, if approved, will stand out and be larger and taller than the community currently is right now. Mr. Nolan advised that there is a height restriction, and because the building will be so large and so high, is there consideration for neighbouring properties and what they will be seeing once the structure is built.

Committee member Revill noted that there is a fairly steep hill that will help with the impacts of a taller building being proposed.

The Applicant, Mr. Mendes advised that he will be storing two boats and a seadoo in the garage, and then the top portion will be for storage of canoes and kayaks, right now there is no available storage on the property. With respect to the view, the garage will fit into the side of the hill and no ones sightlines of the lake will be impacted due to the structure. Mr. Mendes noted that he spoke to most of his neighbours and they did not have any concerns.

Committee member Nolan asked about the intent of the height restrictions in the current zoning by-law, is it to do with blocking views, or the way it looks in the community, or both, or the size versus the other structures in the area?

The Planner noted that the current zoning by-law is from 2003, and the height restrictions are for all of the above she believes. Also taken into consideration are the lot coverage, total size of principal dwelling and all other zoning provisions.

Committee member Nolan agreed that it will not obstruct view, however, it will certainly be the largest building on the point and due to that he does have an issue.

The applicant advised that the next 5 properties over sit about another 50 feet higher than him because they go up the hill, so the finished building will still be less than them, it will not tower over them because he sits at the bottom of the hill.

Committee member Morey commented that he does have absolute respect for member Nolan's comments and he is prepared to support the application, but he is always concerned that the upper story may become living space. He noted, he is glad the applicant spoke with all neighbours and the only thing he doesn't want to see is this come back as accessory dwelling space because he does not feel the property could support it.

The Senior Planner asked the Planner about lot coverage for the dwelling versus the lot coverage for the accessory buildings as brought up by Committee Member Nolan, looking to confirm another section of the zoning by-law does not have to be varied.

The Planner advised that the dwelling with the attached porch will be larger than the proposed garage, the dwelling and porch will be a total of 93 square metres and the detached garage will be 77 square metres.

Committee member Revill asked for an amendment to the resolution that staff contact Quinte Conservation since they will need to do a permit review, to accept their recommendations for roof runoff from the new porch roof. In summary, the amendment would be that "staff accept the recommendations from Quinte Conservation for roof runoff".

The Planner recommended that if the committee is seeking a roof runoff condition, that this be implemented through a Development Agreement and the Township environmental protection policies, and Quinte will work with the permitting on their end.

The amended resolution was read and carried.

Resolution No. 2013-14-10

Moved by Mike Nolan Seconded by Norm Roberts

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-59-21-B for the property municipally known as 606 Old Thirteen Island Lake Road, Thirteen Island Lake, District of Bedford. To permit a covered porch attached to the current dwelling to be setback a minimum of 12.5 metres from the high-water mark of Thirteen Island Lane. And, to permit the detached garage to be setback a minimum of 18 metres from the high-water mark of Thirteen Island Lake and to have a maximum building height of 8.8 metres, consistent with the drawings submitted with the application, subject to conditions, conditions to include a Development Agreement addressing roof runoff and to be registered on title to the property.

Carried

d) MV-61-21-L (Hay) (Stokes)

**Location:** 1020 Brawley Lane

**Purpose and Effect:**

To vary section 5.8.2a) and 8.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a single detached dwelling with an attached deck to be located 27 metres from the highwater mark whereas the Zoning By-law requires a 30 metres setback from the highwater mark and to allow 5.6% lot coverage for the principal dwelling, whereas a maximum of 5% is permitted.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

The Agent questioned the requirement for the Development Agreement and asked for staff clarification as to why it is required.

The Planner added that Cataraqui Conservation had some recommendations to include, as well to include that roof runoff be directed away from the lake.

The Agent noted that there are costs to the client when a Development Agreement is required and the proposed development is getting further from the lake and the lot is fairly flat. He noted that he did not see in the Cataraqui Conservation comments where they required a Development Agreement.

The Planner noted that the Conservation Authority does not specifically require a Development Agreement, they do make recommendations for environmental protection, regardless of what the Conservation Authority recommends, Township Staff do recommend a Development Agreement to address environmental policies, roof runoff, sediment and erosion controls and other clauses to protect the lake. If the Committee chooses to delete this condition, that is something they can do.

The Agent noted that some larger developments earlier did not require this condition.

The chair advised that in his time on the Committee, this condition is quite standard.

Resolution No. 2013-14-11

Moved by Mike Nolan Seconded by Norm Roberts

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-61-21-L for the property located at 1020 Brawley Lane, Sydenham Lake, District of Loughborough. To permit a single detached dwelling with attached deck to be setback a minimum of 27 metres from the front lot line and high-water mark of Sudenham Lake. And to permit a lot coverage of 5.6%, consistent with the revised drawings submitted on January 29, 2022, subject to conditions.

Carried

e) MV-62-21-S (Gilmour)

**Location:** 1002 Lucas Lane

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary section 5.8.2a) and 10.3.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit a screened-in porch to be located 27.4 metres from the highwater mark whereas the Zoning By-law requires a 30 metres setback from the highwater mark.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Gee visited the site and advised it is the ideal place for this development.

Committee member Roberts inquired why there is a window on the sketch if it is a screened in porch.

The Planner advised this is a question for the applicant.

The applicant advised that there is no intention of putting a window in the screened in porch. It may have also been a sunlight that the designer had included, but there are no windows proposed.

The applicants also inquired about their second option that they had submitted, a request to extend 1.4 metres, based on the Cataraqui Conservation comments, would they be able to do a cantilever deck?

The Planner advised that the option to get closer to the water was not able to be supported by planning staff and was not circulated to the public or evaluated. Cataraqui Conservation received both proposals and spoke to the cantilever deck as a possibility, but this is not what was evaluated or circulated and it not what the Committee is voting on tonight. If the applicants wish to proceed with that proposal, they would have to go through the process again.

Resolution No. 2013-14-12

Moved by Mike Nolan Seconded by Norm Roberts

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-62-21-S for the property located at 1002 Lucas Lane, Loughborough Lake, District of Storrington. To permit a screened-in porch attached to the existing dwelling to be located a minimum of 27 metres from the high-water mark of Loughborough Lake, District of Storrington, consistent with the drawings submitted with the application, subject to conditions.

Carried

f) MV-63-21-L (Waliani) (Sawany)

**Location:** 4407-4411 George Street, Sydenham

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To request permission under section 45(2) of the Planning Act to change the 1500 square foot convenience retail store use on the property into two retail

store uses. These uses would be a 1100 square foot pharmacy and 400 square foot other retail space. This permission is requested because commercial uses are not permitted in the Urban Multiple Residential (UMR) zone. The house and apartment on the property would remain unchanged.

The Senior Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Howe noted the process of putting a pharmacy in rural communities is controlled by the pharmacy companies and he wondered if there was thing that would be stuck to this.

The Senior Planner advised that there is no specification of a pharmacy in the recommendations for permitted uses, the approval will be for two retail spaces so as to not make the approval too restrictive.

The applicant, Mr. Sawany advised that the pharmacy is independently owned and therefore there are no regulations. Their intention is to revitalize the main street business.

Resolution No. 2013-14-13

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application MV-62-21-L for the property municipally known as 4407-2211 George Street, District of Loughborough. To permit a change to the 139.4 square metre (1500 squarefoot) convenience retail store use on the subject property into two retail store uses, subject to conditions.

Carried

g) PL-ZNA-2022-0003 (Parkinson) (Gurr)

**Location:** 25 Ironwood Lane, Bedford

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary section 5.24.2 of the Zoning By-law to permit the construction of a detached garage being located in the projected front yard whereas the Zoning by-law requires an accessory building to be erected to the rear of the projected front or exterior side wall of the main building.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Nolan advised that the site for the garage is hidden and will not be visible by surrounding properties and he supports this application.

Committee member Revill advised that in practical terms, this is the best location for the structure.

The agent, Mr. Gurr brought up the first condition that noted 80 metre setback from Perth Road, and he asked if this could be removed or reduced as this was an approximate measurement.

Committee member Revill asked for clarification as to the 80 metre condition in the recommendations.

The Planner noted that there is no minimum setback because this is an accessory in the front yard, the 80 metres was provided as a reference and is what was on the applicant's sketch.

Committee member Revill advised he is concerned that the applicant will be stuck to this 80 metres and it could prevent the applicant from moving forward.

Committee member Nolan asked if the applicant will be required to measure this if the condition is left in there?

The Planner advised that yes, typically the building department will confirm setbacks for Minor Variances.

Committee member Revill noted he believes that the sketch shows the intended placement of the garage, and he would be inclined to amend the condition as the site plan is to be used and not a restrictive measurement.

Committee member Nolan advised that he agreed, he would be satisfied with the condition being removed, but having the setback measured is a waste of time because there is no way the garage is getting close to Perth Road.

The Planning Assistant advised that we cannot remove the entire condition because it ties the Minor Variance to the sketch and approves the structure. At Committee direction we could remove a portion or amend the setback, but it is not recommended to remove the entire condition.

Committee member Revill advised that if there is even a one foot short the applicant will lose their approval.

The Senior Planner advised that the planner recommendation did give a 4 metre buffer between what was requested and what was recommended. She added that reducing the recommended setback is okay, but there should be a minimum required setback that the applicants and agents are required to meet.

The Agent, Mr. Gurr advised that the drawing is 275 feet plus or minus and it was not an exact.

The Planning Assistant advised that the minimum setback from the front yard for a principal building is 20 metres, taking that into consideration with the Agent and Applicant's input and comfortability of a chosen number would be. Luckily, the sketch does say "plus or minus", but whatever the Committee members choose is a minimum.

Committee member Revill proposed that the motion and recommendation be amended to 70 metres.

The agent advised that he was much more comfortable with this number.

Resolution No. 2013-14-14

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application PL-ZNA-2022-0003 for the property municipally known as 25 Ironwood Lane, District of Bedford. To permit an accessory building, being a detached garage to be located in the projected front yard of the dwelling, in accordance with the drawings submitted with the application, subject to conditions, with condition #1 to amend 80 metres to 70 metres.

Carried

h) PL-ZNA-2022-0005 (Sunderland)

**Location:** 80 Burns Lane North, Bedford

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance:**

To vary section 5.24.1 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit the total lot coverage of an accessory building (detached garage) to exceed the lot coverage of the existing principal building and section 10.3.2 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit the detached garage to have a maximum building height

of 10 metres whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum height of 6 metres for accessory structures.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee Member Nolan noted that the location of the structures is quite high and will not be visible to surrounding properties, the applicant will be putting solar panels on the garage and therefore a certain pitch is required which is part of the reason for the height increase.

Committee member Revill advised that the applicant also would like to put a vehicle lift in the building which is another reason for the height of the building. He does not believe that the garage will obstruct any views.

Resolution No. 2013-14-15

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby approves Minor Variance Application PL-ZNA-2022-0005 for the property located at 80 Burns Lane North, Bobs Lake, District of Bedford. To permit an accessory building, being a detached garage to have a maximum height of 10 metres in accordance with the drawings submitted, subject to conditions.

Carried

i) PL-ZNA-2022-0006 (Splinter)

**Location:** Roll Number: 1029-040-020-20305, Loughborough

**Purpose and Effect of the Proposed Variance**

To vary section 5.8.2a) and 10.3.2 of Zoning By-law No. 2003-75 to permit an accessory structure to be located 15 metres from the wetland whereas the Zoning By-law requires a 30 metres setback from any waterbody and also to permit an accessory structure (detached garage) to have a maximum building height of 6.4 metres, whereas the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of 6 metres.

The Planner delivered her report to the Committee.

Committee member Howe advised that he had difficulty following the presentation as it did not download properly onto his iPad. He would like to hear comments from neighbours and have a chance to address them.

The Planner advised that the neighbour is on the line as planning staff had encouraged him to attend to ask the applicant questions staff could not answer.

Committee member Morey asked for clarification of where the attached deck is going to be on the house.

The Planner advised that it is outlined in black and white stripes.

Committee member Nolan asked the applicant why the site was disturbed prior to this application being approved.

The applicant advised that his brother disturbed the lands to see what was under the dirt to see what could be built, they were exploring to see what was there.

The chair asked for further clarification.

The applicant advised that the property was accessed in a different location and so in order to get into the site they had to use a machine to get in because

they could not park on the neighbours property, so that is why they moved the dirt.

The chair advised that he was not going to argue, but the removal of the 30 metre buffer to access the property is a bit excessive.

A member of the public advised that his biggest challenge that he has at this time is that the original drainage area was 30 feet wide, and is now only approximately 4 feet, so therefore the water is now filling up on either side of the driveway. He inquired when and how it will be required to be fixed and what will be done to move forward to prevent flooding in the future.

The Planner advised that typically any conditions that are related to minor variances such as re-vegetation of the 30 metre buffer zone and lot grading and drainage would be tied to the building permit.

The Senior Planner advised she has not been out to the property, but the Conservation Authority advised that this was not a watercourse under their regulation and therefore they would not be pursuing any restoration to the water channel. It is her opinion that under our zoning by-law it would be a watercourse, but there is no recourse to restore the channel. She advised that she believes that it would be appropriate to require a lot grading and drainage plan to address these issues.

The Planner advised that at that time there is no condition recommended for a lot grading and drainage plan, but this is something that the Committee could choose to add.

Committee member Nolan asked if there is any way to make the conditions go in an order that they have to be fulfilled so that the lot can get back to where it was before the structures are built.

The planner advised that the conditions can be structured however they like but her recommendation is to be after the building has taken place so the lot can properly re-vegetate.

Committee member Nolan advised he would like to see drainage issues dealt with prior to building.

Committee member Revill advised that he believed that it may be appropriate to defer the matter and have all committee members attend the property to determine what conditions should be imposed.

Committee member Howe advised that he supports a deferral.

Committee member Morey asked to actually take a look at what they are being asked to take a look at which is a Minor Variance for an accessory structure. Committee member Morey asked if there was a deferral what kind of a situation would they be getting into?

The Planner advised that the applicant can apply and start on their building permits for the sewage system and primary dwelling because both comply with all aspects of the zoning by-law.

Committee member Morey advised that he believes that asking to re-vegetate the whole lot seems outside of what the application is seeking.

The neighbour advised that the reality of what has already happened is already causing flooding, he approached Council and the Ministry of Environment to

see what has happened. He advised he does not have a problem with the application he just wants the matter of flooding addressed.

The applicant advised that the 8 inch black culver picture shows as much water as he has ever seen, he has never seen flooding in that area. The neighbours property is actually elevated above the lane way. He noted that there is drainage happening and nothing has changed since Conservation staff and Township staff attended the property.

Mr. Glaze spoke to the matter and advised he lives in England and is relying on Mr. Piltz to advise him on the site conditions. He advised he does not have a problem with the location of the building or the height, but he is concerned with the flooding and removal of vegetation, and his cottage is in a lower part of the lands. He advised he does want the drain looked at to ensure adequate flow.

Ms. Bennett advised she is a neighbour on the lake, and is surprised by the process, and asked if there were experts from the Conservation Authority that went out to the site and assessed the impacts of the development on the lake.

The Planner advised that yes, the Conservation Staff and Township Staff visited the property on November 24, 2021.

Ms. Bennett advised that it is surprising to her that they did not note the affect on the ecosystem and wetlands.

Mr. Piltz wanted it noted that he has been living there for 5 years and he has never had an issue with flooding, but he cannot even mow his lawn anymore because of the flooding.

The Planner reiterated that the application is for the accessory building being increased in height and to be located closer to the wetland than the zoning by-law allows. If the Committee wishes to add remediation as conditions, that is something they can choose to do. Staff have asked that the culvert be appropriately sized as a condition. The Committee may also choose to implement a lot grading and drainage plan as a condition.

Committee member Nolan asked if it is known where the wetlands are?

The Planner advised that the Conservation Authority flagged where the wetlands are and the applicant also got the site surveyed.

Committee member Revill moved that the matter be deferred, Committee member Howe seconded the motion.

Committee member Nolan advised he has concerns that if the matter is deferred and there is a thaw, the flooding will get worse.

Committee member Revill advised the motion to defer is non-debatable.

Committee member Roberts advised he does not think all of the snow will be gone next month.

Resolution No. 2013-14-16

Moved by Alan Revill Seconded by Mike Howe

THAT the Township of South Frontenac Committee of Adjustment hereby defers Minor Variance Application PL-2022-0006.

Carried

Minutes of Committee Of Adjustment  
February, 10, 2022

- a) Report to Committee - Consents Approved through Delegated Authority

10 Adjournment

- a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2013-14-17

Moved by Norm Roberts Seconded by Mike Nolan

THAT the February 10, 2022 meeting of the Township of South Frontenac  
Committee of Adjustment is hereby adjourned at 9:28 p.m., to reconvene on  
Thursday, March 10, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

Carried

---

Randy Ruttan, Chair