

November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015

GL/A-15:317

Alex Alexander  
22 Bellstone Lane, Glanbrook

Appearances were:

John Witten, Agent on behalf of the applicant. Interested parties were: Keith Bickham, RR1, 36 Bellstone Lane, SS5, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0; Paul Trebilcock, RR1, 39 Bellstone Lane, SS5, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0; Jim Haight, 35 Bellstone Lane, SS5, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0; Tom Palloway, 31 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0.

Those members present for the hearing of this application were: M. Dudzic (Chairman), V. Abraham, W. Pearce, M. Smith, D. Smith, D. Serwatuk, P. Mallard, N. Mleczo.

A summary comment from the Planning and Economic Development Division together with comments from other departments and agencies were entered into the record.

Letters were entered into the record from: Louie & Lisa Simeonidis, 37 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0; Anne-Marie Bickham, 36 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, ON L0R 1W0; Scott Wlodarczyk, 38 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, ON LOR 1W0.

- |               |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|
| K. Bickham    | - | read a prepared statement that was submitted for the record (see attached)          |
| P. Trebilcock | - | his major concern is that everyone else has to comply                               |
|               | - | the builder wouldn't let him make any changes                                       |
|               | - | the by-law says 7m; he doesn't mind some variance but this is 12' being taken away  |
|               | - | this being a corner lot affects a fair amount of people                             |
|               | - | this is the kind of thing that doesn't belong in this neighbourhood                 |
| J. Haight     | - | he has a side view of this property   |
|               | - | he supports Keith in what he's doing  |
|               | - | he would hope someone would support him if he was in the same spot as Keith         |
| J. Witten     | - | typically all of these things get taken into consideration when designing a sunroom |
|               | - | he believes this has minimal impact on the neighbours                               |
|               | - | he thought his client spoke with the neighbor at 36 Bellstone                       |

GL/A-15:317

Page 2

- K. Bickham
- his neighbor told him it was going to be "little" sunroom
  - this is huge; it's the size of his livingroom
  - this is going to be right on top of him
- D. Serwatak  
(Committee Member)
- if the issue is a matter of size he would recommend tabling so the agent could go back to his client to see if the size could be changed to something that everyone could live with
  - the Committee could perform a site inspection and in the meantime the applicant could consider reducing the size
- J. Witten
- there is a jut out already; it's actually an additional 12' not 17'
  - he is not opposed to a site visit but doesn't think reducing the size would make much difference
- W. Pearce  
(Committee Member)
- he visited the property and noted that there is a solid high fence between the properties
  - from the road you can only see about a one foot elevation difference
  - this is not an unusual type of application
  - there is a lot of backyard left here
  - he thinks it would be good for the rest of the Committee members to do a site inspection
- J. Haight
- questioned if a smaller sunroom could be built without a variance
- W. Pearce  
(Committee Member)
- responded that yes it could
- K. Bickham
- he has been here for 15 years
  - in most cases you are dealing with backyard to backyard; this is backyard to sideyard which he believes make a huge difference
- P. Trebilcock
- questioned if they are going to step down into the sunroom
- J. Witten
- typically as people get older they want things on the same level
  - he thinks that he has done his due diligence

...../3

GL/A-15:317  
Page 3

Following discussion it was moved by Mr. Serwatuk and seconded by Mr. Pearce that the application be **TABLED** for site inspection.

**CARRIED.**

The Secretary-Treasurer stated that the application will be re-scheduled to the meeting of November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at 1:10 p.m.

November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015

GL/A-15:317

Alex Alexander  
22 Bellstone Lane, Glanbrook

Application was previously tabled to allow the Committee Members to conduct a site inspection

Those members present for the hearing of this application were: D. Smith (Acting Chairman), V. Abraham, W. Pearce, L. Gaddy, P. Mallard, N. Mleczko.

A summary comment from the Planning and Economic Development Division together with comments from other departments and agencies were entered into the record.

Letters were entered into the record from: Pam O'Reilly, 43 Bellstone Lane, Mount Hope, On LOR 1W0

P. Mallard

- conducted a site inspection and this changed his view
- does not think that the side yard request would maintain a sense of streetscape
- feels the addition into the side yard would have a detrimental effect on the streetscape

N. Mleczko

- concurs with Mr. Mallard

J. Witten

- with full leaves the addition would not be that noticeable

Following discussion it was moved by Mr. Mallard and seconded by Ms. Mleczko that variance #1 be **DENIED** for the following reasons:

1. The Committee having regard to the evidence is of the opinion that the relief requested is beyond that of a minor nature.
2. The relief requested is undesirable for the appropriate development of the land and building and is inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the By-law and of the Official Plan as referred to in Section 45 of The Planning Act, 1990.
3. The Committee having regard to the intensity of use of the subject parcel of land is of the opinion that such development would not be appropriate for the lands.

GL/A-15:317  
Page 2

Following discussion it was moved by Mr. Mallard and seconded by Ms. Mieczko that variance #2 be **GRANTED** for the following reasons:

1. The Committee, having regard to the evidence, is of the opinion that the relief granted is of a minor nature.
2. The relief granted is desirable for the appropriate development of the land and building and is not inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the By-law and the Official Plan as referred to in Section 45 of The Planning Act, 1990.
3. The Committee, having regard to the evidence, is satisfied that there will be no adverse impact on any of the neighbouring lands.

**CARRIED.**