

March 27, 2025



COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

DATE March 27, 2025

MEETING NO. 03-25

TIME 2:00 p.m.

PLACE Council Chambers

* Electronic Participation using MS teams.

Tyler Rizzuto, Member
Jodi Corbett, Member
Brian Phillips, Member
Matthew Pascuzzo, Member

Adam Crago, Planner II
Zachary Mezzatesta, Planning Technician
Decio Lopes, Supervisor
Arden Irish, Planner I
* Ryan Furtado, Engineering Department
Penny Turner, Minute Recorder

ABSENT: Andreas Petersen and Normand Roy sent regrets.

Acting Chair Pascuzzo outlined the procedure which the Committee would follow in dealing with applications and then called for a poll of Disclosures of Interest. The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer polled the Committee Members.

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST: Member Pascuzzo, A-01-2025 for Business dealings

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Member Pascuzzo left the hearing due to conflict with application A-01-2025. Member Rizzuto to chair the hearing.

APPLICATIONS

1. Application No. **A-01-2025** John Ostrowski
Lot 3 Plan 56 Syndicate Avenue (571/575)

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer provided an overview of the Minor Variance application.
The Minor Variance application is to reduce the minimum interior side setbacks from 3m to 1.5m on both sides.

Applicant John Ostrowski confirmed the sign was posted and commented that it is a minor variance application, a side-by-side semidetached core floor and trying to go barrier free which was the reasoning for his going this route.

COMMENTS:

- The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer read the correspondence,
- Tbaytel, and Realty Services had no comments or concerns.
 - Building Services commented the applicant is to ensure adequate services are extended to the property.

March 27, 2025

- Parks & Open Spaces commented that the applicant utilizes the existing curb cut on Syndicate Avenue for driveway access to not disturb the root zone of the existing street tree. A driveway permit would not be supported. Also, recommend as part of the Building Permit process tree protection be required for the street tree fronting the property as per the Parks and Open Spaces Section Standards and Specifications and be installed and approved to the satisfaction of the Parks and Open Spaces Division prior to any construction beginning on site.
- Synergy North and Engineering had no comments or concerns.
- Heritage Advisory Committee had no issues with the property.
- MTO commented that the property was outside their permit authority.

Planning Comments were read by Planner Irish on behalf of Planner Crago, the application is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement and does not conflict with the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario, and passes the four tests for a minor variance, and met the requirements for the Zoning By-Law and conforms to the Official Plan. Planning Services supports the application as presented.

Acting Chair Rizzuto asked the applicant if he understood and agreed to the comments. The applicant understood and agreed to the condition and commented that the curb cut would remain the same.

Members had no questions.

Acting Chair Rizzuto called for a vote. All members were in favour. The majority of members have supported the approval of the application, and therefore the application was approved.

Member Pascuzzo returned to chair the hearing.

2. Application No. A-07-2025

JJ Innovation Ventures
(Jaison Johnson, Ryan Campbell)
185 Limbrick Street

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer provided an overview of the Minor Variance application.

The Minor Variance application is to gain relief from Zoning By-Law 1-2022, as set forth in the application, to reduce the minimum lot frontage from 9m to 8m.

The applicant Jaison Johnson and agent Ryan Campbell confirmed the sign was posted.

COMMENTS:

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer read the correspondence,

- Tbaytel and Realty Services had no comments or concerns.
- Engineering and Synergy North had no concerns.
- Building Services commented that a building permit is required for the creation of the additional dwelling unit; design drawings required from a professional. Ensure adequate sewer and water services, upgrades maybe required.
- Parks and Open Spaces and Heritage Advisory Committee had no concern or comments.
- MTO commented that property is outside the permit authority.

Planning Comments were read by Planner Crago on behalf of Planning Technician Mezzatesta confirming the application is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, does not conflict with the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario, meets with the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan, and the Zoning By-Law. It passed the

March 27, 2025

four tests; therefore, Planning Services supports the application as presented with the following condition:

- That prior to the issuance of the required Building Permit the Chief Building Official is satisfied that all encroaching accessory buildings are removed, demolished, or relocated in accordance with the Utility Easement and that any applicable permits for those are obtained as required.

Acting Chair Pascuzzo asked the applicant if they understood and agreed to the condition. The applicant understood and agreed to the condition.

Opposing speaker is an abutting neighbour who is speaking for himself and 16 neighbours. They are very frustrated, angry and concerned about the number of homes being purchased on the block and being turned into rentals by out of town landlords, young families not being able to buy homes and having to rent due to high costs of house prices, too many vehicles parking inappropriately in yards and on the street, snow removal and garbage build up, and parking congestion on street causing safety issues for emergency vehicles.

Member Corbett asked the applicant what his plans were for parking. The Agent for the applicant responded that there are two parking spaces available, one for each unit. Member Corbett asked Planning about the parking concerns and the emergency vehicles access concerns. Planning responded that the applicant did respond that there two parking spaces, one per unit, on site being provided. Vehicles parking inappropriately can be directed to By-Law Enforcement and Parking Authority. As for the emergency vehicles, Planning was not aware of which department to direct to, possibly engineering. Member Corbett asked if contact information for By-Law Enforcement for complaints for parking was available. Planning responded that the contact information can be made available for the public. Member Rizzuto asked the speaker if he was against it being a rental or did not like the one metre reduction on the property. The speaker responded that he did not really object to the application that this was an opportunity to vent his concerns of the rentals, parking/vehicles issues, snow removal, garbage, and more people on the block.

Acting Chair Pascuzzo clarified that the application said there is two parking spaces available, one per unit on site. Member Rizzuto asked Planning for clarification of the rental unit. Planning clarified that it is permitted within the zone, it does not dictate whether it is a rental or ownership. It permits semidetached with 2 units, or 2 homes as referred to in the Zoning By-Law. Member Phillips asked Planning to confirm the one parking space per unit. Planning confirmed that it is following the Zoning By-Law with the one parking space per unit. Acting Chair Pascuzzo asked what would parking be for a home down the block. Planning responded that the parking would be one space per unit except for a six-unit apartment which would be different. Acting Chair Pascuzzo asked the applicant how long they have owned the home, was it a recent purchase. The agent for the applicant responded that it has been a rental for a while as a single unit and the application is to create a unit in the basement to become two homes and it is previously rented.

Member Phillips asked the speaker if he has tried to call By-Law Enforcement to report the parking issues. The speaker responded that he has tried on several occasions and got no response. Member Rizzuto asked the speaker if they have any issues with the house or the application right now. The speaker responded that the house may look different than the rest of the neighbourhood due to the construction, it's another rental, another lost opportunity for someone to own locally instead of it being outsourced by out-of-town landlords. Member Rizzuto asked Planning and Engineering if parking was allowed on the street. Planning and Engineering both responded that parking was allowed on the street. The speaker responded that he has previously checked into changing street parking with Parking Authority, and he would need to get signatures from homeowners to have parking changed to one sided or not at all on street, but he knows landlord will not sign due to the number of tenants that have too many vehicles.

March 27, 2025

Opposing speaker number two is also an abutting neighbour who concerned about the lack of information on the notices, the size of rooms/number of rooms going into new units, number of families or people moving into the new homes, safety issue of the garbage from the construction site being left outside, parking spaces, more vehicles, snow removal, want limitations or conditions placed on application. Acting Chair Pascuzzo commented that the committee does not have the authority to deal with garbage, or parking or By- Law as it relates to parking on the street. He encouraged the speaker to contact his city councillor and By-Law Enforcement. Acting Chair Pascuzzo commented that the committee is focused on for this application is: is it minor, is it desirable for the appropriate development and use of land, building and or structure, does it maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-Law, does it maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan. This is how the committee makes its decisions and suggested that the applicant could answer the question about the number of bedrooms.

The agent for the applicant responded that the basement unit would be a one-bedroom unit, and the existing unit would be a three-bedroom unit.

Acting Chair Pascuzzo asked Planning why the one-meter reduction maybe required. Planning responded the lot frontage minimum required is 9m and the lot is only 8m therefore the reduction is required, and there are no changes being made to the outside to be building, parking is being met through the Zoning By- Law and building permits will take care of the size and number of rooms. Member Corbett asked the speaker what kind of conditions they were thinking of having placed on the application. The speaker responded with suggestions of having a bin for collecting the construction waste and garbage, limit the number of vehicles for the units and have more information for future notices.

Opposing speaker number three is also an abutting neighbour who expressed his frustrated statement profanely.

The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer read the condition. Acting Chair Pascuzzo asked the agent if they understood and agreed to the condition. The agent for the applicant understood and agreed to the condition and commented that they managed several units in towns and are aware of parking issues and are trying to follow the By-Laws, trying to assist with helping people find affordable housing with this new unit close to bus route.

Acting Chair Pascuzzo called for a vote. All members were in favour. The majority of members have supported the approval of the application and therefore the application was approved.

OLD BUSINESS - none

NEW BUSINESS - To appoint Planner Irish to Acting Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Moved by Member Phillips, Seconded by Member Corbett. All Members voted in favour; therefore, the appointment was approved.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 2:59 pm. Moved by Member Phillips, Seconded by Member Rizzuto, all members voted in favour, therefore the meeting was adjourned.



CHAIR



SECRETARY-TREASURER