

CITY OF WINDSOR
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES

FOR THE HEARING OF

July 10, 2025

A virtual hearing by the Committee of Adjustment for the City of Windsor was held on July 10, 2025, by Video Conference. The Hearing was called to order at 3:30 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Committee Members

Joe Balsamo, Chair (A)
Dante Gatti, Member
Frank Cerasa, Member
Mike Sleiman, Member

Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer
Riley Dufour, Committee Clerk

Regrets:
Mohammed Baki, Member

Also in attendance, Administrative staff representing the interests of the City of Windsor were:

Planning & Building Services Department

Greg Atkinson, Deputy City Planner
Laura Strahl, Manager, Development Applications
Brian Velocci, Site Plan Approval Officer
Connor Wilson, Planner
Stefan Pavlica, Zoning Co-ordinator
Conner O'Rourke, Zoning Co-ordinator
Diana Radulescu, Planner
Averil Parent, Planner

Engineering & Geomatics Department

Andrew Boroski, Technologist I

Transportation Planning Department

Elara Mehlou, Transportation Engineer

* * * * *

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
and the general nature thereof

Member D. Gatti confirms a conflict with respect to the following items:

B-042/25 - 1400 Provincial - Consent to Create a New Lot
B-045/25 - 1370 Argyle/2109 Ottawa St - Consent for a Technical Severance

And removes himself from the proceedings.

FILE: A-051/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): NICHOLAS RAMDIAL

Subject Lands: PLAN 311 LOT 3 S PT LOT 2 and known as Municipal Number 663
MARENTETTE AVE

Zoning: Residential RD2.2

RELIEF: Conversion of an existing lodging house into a multiple dwelling
with four dwelling units, requesting relief from the reduced minimum
lot width and area requirements for a multiple dwelling.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Nicholas Ramdial, Owner
Shawn Piskovic, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Ramdial confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Cerasa asks if this is a new building. The owner states that this is an existing structure being repaired and renovated and there's a small addition to the back portion of the dwelling that was damaged. The deck in the back is being reconstructed to facilitate access to all the units at the rear. The relief being sought today is for the lot width and area.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-039/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): TILBURY CONCRETE TRANSPORT INC

Subject Lands: CON 3 PT LOTS 89 & 90;RP 12R13285 PART 4 & PT OF;PART 2; and known as Municipal Number 3480 MARENTETTE AVE

Zoning: Manufacturing MD1.1

REQUEST: Consent to create an easement for servicing a storm water management system.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Ibrahim Manser, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Manser confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. He outlines that consent for an easement is required to service a stormwater management system. The easement is in favor of the registered owner of 3440 Marentette. The stormwater management system is on 3480. Mr. Cerasa asks if the Ministry of Environment is required, the applicant outlines there was approval.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-040/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): MARK NICHOLAS CHIARELLA, LYNN CHIARELLA

Subject Lands: PLAN 1106 LOTS 118 & 119;PT LOT 117 PT BLK A & PT;ALLEY and known as Municipal Number 649 EDINBOROUGH ST

Zoning: Residential RD1.3

REQUEST: Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Mark Chiarella, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Chiarella outlines he is in not in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration with respect to the demolition of the existing garage on the property. Ms. Parent outlines the By-law is in a residential area which stipulates a single garage on a lot is not permitted. Mr. Gatti asks administration "What if you had two houses side by side? It would comply then because there's a residential dwelling on each. Ms. Parent addresses, if there were two houses on one lot and the request to sever the lot, then that would be fine because both lots would have residential, as a primary residence and then this is considered an accessory dwelling. It cannot be it stand alone. It must have a main house on the Lot included. A building permit would not be issued either. Mr. Cerasa asks If he has granted a severance on the condition that a house be built later, would he be responsible? Ms. Parent outlined that is correct.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: D. Gatti
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: A-052/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): CENTURY 21 TEAMS & ASSOCIATES LTD

Subject Lands: PLAN 687 LOT 120 and known as Municipal Number 1317-1321
OTTAWA ST

Zoning: Commercial CD2.2

RELIEF: Seeking relief for the reduction in required amenity space and parking spaces for the addition of 4 residential units to an existing commercial building.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Anthony Pipolo, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Secretary-Treasurer states that there have been objections received with respect to the proposed and have been shared with administration, the Applicant and the Committee of Adjustment for review prior to these proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted

DISCUSSION

Mr. Pipolo confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Angelica Chavin and Ken French, Neighbor, comes forward. They would like to know how deep the structure is going to come into the parking lot and ask if the hair salon is going to be gone. They ask if it's going to be made into a four-unit apartment? Mr. Pipolo confirms Yes, the commercial units will maintain themselves and the proposed residential will be built on top of the commercial units with the existing parking lot to remain. They will be proposing a cantilever to the back area, 23 feet of a cantilever to the back. The existing parking lot will remain. It will take up one of the spaces that is there. And it is not going to cover the whole parking lot at all.

Moved by: D. Gatti
Seconded by: F. Cerasa

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: A-053/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): FRANK AMANTE

Subject Lands: PLAN 470 W PT LOT 12 WATER; LOT & PT OLD RIVER FR RD; CLSD;
and known as Municipal Number 8254 RIVERSIDE DR E

Zoning: Residential RD1.6

RELIEF: Proposed development of a single unit dwelling requesting relief for
reduced minimum front yard depth.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Frank Amante, Owner

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Amante confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS** as applied for.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-041/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): GATEWAY VILLAGE INC

Subject Lands: CON 1 PT LOT 63 PT LOT 64; SANDWICH W RP 12R14334 PARTS; 1 2; and known as Municipal Number 0 HURON CHURCH RD

REQUEST: Severance of lands, for the purpose of creating a new lot with easements.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Paul Kitson, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Kitson confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Cerasa outlines he believes that this has come before the committee before and is not before the committee again due to finance issues. The applicant outlines that it is correct.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS** as applied for.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-044/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): VENUS GLORY INC.

Subject Lands: PLAN 640; LOT 22; N PT LOT 23 & PT CLOSED ALLEY; RP 12R23075; PARTS 26 & 27 and known as Municipal Number 981-983 CAMPBELL AVE

Zoning: Residential RD2.2

REQUEST: Severance of lands, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Shan Xue, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Xue confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Mr. Gatti asks are both lots post severance will be compliant with respect to the width, correct? And the size. Mr. Xue outlines 23m. Ms. Parent outlines that there are no variances associated with the severance and zoned Rd. 2. They are currently building a semi-detached. The foundation walls for the semi-detached are in place and now and the applicants are requesting a severance, with no minor variance. Mr. Gatti asks if there is something currently existing. Ms. Parent outlines the understanding is the foundation walls for the semi-detached building are built and inspectors confirm that the foundation walls are in the correct place, they will provide the applicant the "OK" to apply for severance along the interior wall.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-042/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): CRATA EQUITIES

Subject Lands: SANDWICH EAST CON 5 PT LOT 15 RP 12R3653 PT PART 1 and known as Municipal Number 1400 PROVINCIAL RD

Zoning: Commercial CD4.1

REQUEST: Severance of lands, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Jack Ramieri, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

D. Gatti declares conflict and has removed himself from the proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Ramieri confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: M. Sleiman

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-043/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): 1998308 ONTARIO INC

Subject Lands: PLAN 708; LOTS 629 TO 638 and known as Municipal Number 1561 ARMANDA ST

Zoning: Residential RD1.1

REQUEST: Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Tracey Pillon-Abbs, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Secretary-Treasurer states that there have been objections received with respect to the proposed and have been shared with administration, the Applicant and the Committee of Adjustment for review prior to these proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Pillon-Abbs confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration, and addresses, the applicant did file a separate application last month and was denied by the Committee of Adjustment. This is a reapplication. To review, there's 10 lots in total, existing legal lots of records and essentially, it's a lot line adjustment that brings the lots closer into zoning compliance. She states as it is currently her client could apply for a building permit for the two sides, but what this application essentially makes the lot that's with the existing dwellings smaller to make the other lots bigger and gives more room to build. One of the lots includes a drainage easement. There are no new lots being created. It's just the way the application is for you that severs off the middle one and automatically creates the two on each side. There are only two new lots, which is a little different than what the public comments said. There are not four lots there. Only two new lots and one retained. 2 new single detached dwellings are being proposed, not semis or duplexes, and it is felt that this resubmission does address some of the Committee of Adjustment concerns that were brought up last month with respect to fit with the neighborhood, and these lots are a little larger than some of the existing lots that are in the area. Ms. Pillon-Abbs had an opportunity to review some of the public consultations and respond to some of the comments. A traffic impact study was noted. The municipality has not warranted any traffic impact study, and it's not anticipated that traffic will be increased. A flood prone area and flooding was noted. She outlines - Yes, it is within an ERCA regulated area and ERCA permits will be obtained. ERCA has been pre-consulted as well. It was noted that this is an Environmental Protection designated area. Yes, it is and ministry clearance as a condition of approval and a fencing plan will be provided as a condition of approval as well. Drainage study was requested. The set back from the drain will be provided. That's PT 4. It's a proposed easement to protect the drain so it can be maintained and keep the houses that are planned for PT 3 away from it. So that easement is a condition of approval and will be registered on title. Existing storm sewer site servicing drawing is a condition of approval. So that will be provided and as well it will be addressed at the time of the building permit, and it was noted that a planning rationale report should be completed and she confirmed that one was submitted.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Tracey Greenwood-Bennett & Terri Nada, Neighbour - express concern about a possible build. "We didn't realize it was this meeting was just for a severance". A severance does kind of imply that A build is going to happen. This seems like it's been like a work in progress. So, we are happy with some of the answers that we've heard so far regarding ERCA and the animals and everything. The traffic is still something that will be an issue because it's already an issue. So, any additional home on this street in this location will be an issue as it already is an issue, but again this is just a separation of land, so I guess we'll just have to kind of pay attention until the building starts. It already kind of looks like it has, but that's a subject for another time I guess, and part of the concern of course is the flooding because of the Tikon drain, that is not properly taken care of. We have all the drainage, all the sewage systems here, all the water. Drains into that Tikon drain, drains into that ditch and if not cleared then it all backs up. She would like to know if additional housing, will be addressed? The storm sewage, the drainage on the street, and the sewage also, will there be a study done that will ensure that we do not have an issue with this? One of our biggest questions is the flooding issue, the drainage, the sewage issue, and the storm sewage issue. That is a concern right now."

The other thing is that we're on the footprint of the proposed Ojibway Urban Park and there is a number of species at risk in this area that we would want to ensure that they are protected during this type of construction that would be an important issue for this neighborhood, as just recently there was a fox snake that was taken from a home here that was in the backyard. Ojibway took it, tagged it, and returned it, and an additional fox snake found just beside the house and other endangered species. Residents have lived here over 40 years. There are families whose grandparents have built their houses, and it has gone down from generation to generation. That is why we live here and that is why we have built our homes out here and thank the committee for listening to their concerns.

James Maxwell, neighbour, 1707 Armanda - I have addressed these issues before to the city, which nothing was what resolved from that. Now I know that there is drainage on that property that if taken out or deferred to another area indicates flooding will be a problem. Flooding has been a major issue impacting this area more because drainage is being disrupted. Now I guess one of my main concerns would be - If construction with any of the building, concern would be if it causes more flooding around my house, and who would assume liability?

The City or the Applicant?

F. Cerasa acknowledges the concerns of the neighbours, and instructs the resident to follow-up with ERCA and states the COA and has no jurisdictions over these issues with respect to those matters. Mr. Cerasa states the application today is strictly for the severance only.

Moved by: D. Gatti

Seconded by: F. Cerasa

Questions on the motion: Mr. Cerasa asks about the study requested by administration. Ms. Pillon-Abbs outlines a stage 1 archaeological assessment has been a requirement for a condition of approval. So that will be a study that the applicant will need to obtain from an archaeologist to carry out the assessment prior to stamping of the deeds.

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: A-055/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:**Owner(s): 5054545 ONTARIO INC.****Subject Lands: SANDWICH EAST CON 2; MCNIFF; PT LOT 95; RP 12R28716; PARTS 1 & 2 and known as Municipal Number 1850 NORTH SERVICE RD****Zoning: Residential RD3.3****RELIEF: Seeking relief for increased maximum building height from 24m to 27m.****INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:**

Jackie Lassaline, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

The Secretary-Treasurer states that there have been objections received with respect to the proposed and have been shared with administration, the Applicant and the Committee of Adjustment for review prior to these proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Lassaline provides a PowerPoint presentation for the committee and public with respect to the proposal and confirms they are not in agreement with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. Ms. Lassaline outlines they had submitted originally for Site Plan Control, went through its review, went through pre-consultation. During the review, we were told that we were not in compliance with the number of issues. Well, the architect was able to completely design out the different issues and with the application that was re-submitted for a minor variance, she provided the updated site plan showing that the only issue is the increase in maximum height. For the buildings, they are designed with a height of 26.5 meters, and therefore a variance of three meters or 27-meter height from the height that's presently permitted at 24 meters. She provides an overall visual of site plan that has been designed for the overall site. She addresses the different phases. In conclusion, the situation we're requesting is the height of the building from 24m to 27m height. In her professional opinion, the requested variance will allow for the provision of efficient and effective development of the residential buildings. Ms. Lassaline outlines she doesn't agree with the recommendation from administration she outlines that there will not be any negative impacts on the neighborhood. She outlines they are making a more efficient utilization of that existing building that's been approved, the five buildings that have been approved, and does not believe that there's going to be any. Mr. Cerasa outlines his concerns about the development being further away from the residents. Ms. Lassaline outlines this is what they are trying to achieve, and outlines she agrees with Mr. Cerasa. Further discussion continues with respect to the building locations with a visual provided by Ms. Lassaline. Mr. Cerasa is satisfied with the explanation. Mr. Gatti is concerned about the 9m and gaining 2 additional stories? Mr. Velocci explained in the zoning amendment that they did previously with the first set of applications, they had a shorter building height, and they had six stories. That's what they presented to the neighborhood and so, they weren't anywhere near the 24 meters. I believe it was a 20-meter-tall building that had six stories. He further explains that's the kind of consensus they'd come to with the neighborhood, and then now what they've done is increased the height, so they have that 4 meters to bring it to the 24 + 3 more to get to 27 and so inside of that almost. Conversation surrounding the stories of the building continues. Mr. Velocci outlines that there have been changes to the site plan and it was received just today prior to the meeting. Mr. Velocci outlines that he requires time to

further review any changes before he provides a recommendation. Mr. Velocci outlines the previous submission, didn't have any dimensions or anything. Mr. Velocci outlines that he is unable to go by "word of mouth" revisions prior to any COA meeting, and he feels there are areas that need to be addressed, and further review is required. Mr. Velocci outlines more time is required for further review, and outlines he had these conversations, and the applicant has moved forward to apply for the variance today. Mr. Velocci outlines that there was a zoning amendment and the now impact of 3 m is that it is a departure for public consultation. Mr. Velocci outlines a review wouldn't change his opinion at all because any information that would come through would only be clarification that there's no other variances other than the building height. So even if time permitted a review, there could possibly be additional variances for parking, there might be a variance for length and landscape open space yard. Mr. Velocci states the building height variance is always going to be there and that is the significant impact that that has brought this to the COA and why we are recommending denial. He outlines the three metres will have an impact on the residents. Ms. Radulescu outlines there were several studies requested at the zoning bylaw amendment stage, including the traffic impact assessment, and those were based on a certain number of units presented to the city and the public and City Council as well. So, if the increase in number of units/stories, and the height of going from 20m to 27m, will result in 54 new units, and it would have a significant impact on the studies already completed at the zoning bylaw stage. So, the cumulative impact of not just it's on paper. It looks like a minor variance on paper of going from 24m to 27m, but the cumulative impact on the subject site itself and the neighborhood as well have not been assessed by council based on the new proposal. She feels, as stated in the report, that this is not an appropriate application for a minor variance. We feel that this would be best addressed through the rezoning process where the study be updated and re-reviewed by council and have neighborhood input should be sought.

Mr. Haider Habib comes forward, he is one of the owners and adds to the conversation, by emphasizing this new design with the site plan and an L-shaped building. With this new design we can remove one building which creates some additional site area for property and asks about parking review? Mr. Velocci outlines that there are still revisions required that he has just received today, and he requires review time for this. Conversation continues and Mr. Cerasa asks to move to motion.

Ms. Radulescu would like to speak to the objections, as part of the discussion I just wanted to add an additional point on echoing what my colleague said and as noted in the report, I think the recommendation from staff just to summarize is that the application currently as it stands in front of us is not considered minor due to the cumulative impacts on the Site in the neighborhood and because staff is of the opinion that it is not minor in nature, it therefore does not meet our minor variance policies in our Official Plan and does not meet the intent of the Official Plan minor variance policy. So, I just wanted to make that note as part of the discussion for the minutes. Ms. Radulescu notes for the record - there was one objection, but I also want to note for the record that the circulation radius is for the zoning bylaw amendment is 200 meters of the subject site and the circulation radius for the Committee of Adjustment meeting is about 15 meters of the subject site. Mr. Pavelic, outlining that we did have public step in to be in attendance for the meeting.

Moved by: D. Gatti to deny the application. No Secunder - Motion does not pass.

Moved by: Mr. Cerasa the application be granted. No Secunder – Motion does not pass

The Secretary -Treasurer outlines that such, a consensus is unable to be reached, the item can be deferred until we have quorum. D. Gatti outlines if Administration requires more information or review opportunity, it would be in the best interest, and he outlines to applicant/agent to warrant that opportunity.

Moved by: D Gatti to defer the item.

Seconded by: F. Cersa supporting and adds an additional 2 weeks from not to be placed on the agenda.

Member Sleiman joined the meeting and asked noted that he knows the applicant and has no financial gains in this item. He speaks about this item and outlines these items have been granted in the past, and this height variance is minor in nature in his opinion. Mr. Sleiman outlines he hasn't had a thorough review of the item, and asks to speak to it.

The Secretary-Treasurer outlines the item was deferred, and on public record. Ms. Diotte outlines the timing and the motion to defer on the table. Mr. Gatti asks the applicant how he would like to move this forward.

Administration outlines that due to the amount of conversation and with respect to the incoming of the additional member of the committee, it would be in the best interest to have the item deferred until the next meeting.

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Second by D. Gatti

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application BE **DEFERRED** to August 7th Committee of Adjustment meeting.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-045/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): DUO FRATRES INC.

Subject Lands: CON 1;PT LOTS 95 & 96 and known as Municipal Number 1370
ARGYLE RD

Zoning: Commercial CD2.2

REQUEST: Technical severance to keep existing properties separate pending
title/ownership merger.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Jack Ramieri, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

D. Gatti declares conflict, and has removed himself from the proceedings.

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Ramieri confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks for public presentation. None noted

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: M. Sleiman

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for.

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: A-054/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): PORTNOV PROPERTIES INC

Subject Lands: PLAN 1099; LOT 72 & S PT LOT 71 and known as Municipal Number 1968 GEORGE AVE

RELIEF: Creating a new lot, requesting relief from the minimum lot area for the severed and retained lots.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Jackie Lassaline, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by - D. Gatti
Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-054/25 and B-047/25; subject **PLAN 1099; LOT 72 & S PT LOT 71 and known as Municipal Number 1968 GEORGE AVE** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Lassaline confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. D Cerasa asks about the particulars of the proposed and if it is the living area. Ms. Lassaline outlines there will be 2 ADUs. This complies with all other variances.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Katherine and Ali – Neighbours. Ms. Katherine would like to ask about the footprint of the building and where the concrete would go to. Mr. Daniel Croft expresses, “We’ve not come across that yet.” We’ve not got that far in to examine that closely. She expresses if there's a fence that's not on the boundary line, typically they would handle that. If it's not in anybody's way, it would be left alone. Ms. Katherine outlines - I just want to see what you guys were planning to do with this fence because I just put it in cement. So, I just want to make sure that it wasn't going to be affected in any way. Mr. Croft outlines that precautions and liability will be in place for this project.

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: M. Sleiman

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED** as applied for

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

FILE: B-047/25

APPLICANT and SUBJECT LANDS:

Owner(s): PORTNOV PROPERTIES INC

Subject Lands: PLAN 1099; LOT 72 & S PT LOT 71 and known as Municipal Number 1968 GEORGE AVE

Zoning: RD.1 RESIDENTIAL

REQUEST: Severance of lands, as shown on the attached drawing, for the purpose of creating a new lot.

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT:

Jackie Lassaline, Agent

PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS

Moved by - D. Gatti
Seconded By – F. Cerasa

That files A-054/25 and B-047/25; subject **PLAN 1099; LOT 72 & S PT LOT 71 and known as Municipal Number 1968 GEORGE AVE** be heard concurrently

The Chair confirms with the applicant if they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration.

The Chair asks if there are any questions/comments from Committee Members and Administration. None noted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Lassaline confirms they agree with the recommendations and comments provided in the report from Administration. D Cerasa asks about the particulars of the proposed and if it is the living area. Ms. Lassaline outlines there will be 2 ADUs.

The Chair asks for public presentation.

Katherine and Ali – Neighbours. Ms. Katherine would like to ask about the footprint of the building and where the concrete would go to. Mr. Daniel Croft expresses, “We’ve not come across that yet. We’ve not got that far in to examine that closely. She expresses if there’s a fence that’s not on the boundary line, typically we would handle that. If it’s not in anybody’s way, we’d leave it alone. Ms. Katherine outlines - I just want to see what you guys were planning to do with this fence because I had just installed cement and wanted to make sure that it wasn’t going to be affected in any way. Mr. Croft outlines that precautions and liability will be in place for this project of neighboring properties.

Moved by: F. Cerasa
Seconded by: M. Sleiman

IT IS HEREBY DECIDED that the application **BE GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS.**

CARRIED.

The Chair advised the applicant that approval of the application is subject to a 20-day appeal period, and that written notice of the decision accompanied by instructions would be duly sent to the owner or authorized agent as prescribed by the Planning Act.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

After reviewing the draft minutes presented by the Secretary-Treasurer, it was

Moved by	M. Sleiman
Second by	D. Gatti

That the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Hearing held **June 26, 2025, BE ADOPTED.**

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting accordingly adjourned at 5:45 PM.

Supported and Adopted:

Joe Balsamo, Chair (A)
Jessica Watson, Secretary-Treasurer