

November 2nd, 2017

GL/A-17:368

Michael & Susan Rahija
2301 Kirk Road, Glanbrook

Appearances were:

Michael Rahija, Applicant. Interested parties were: nil

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

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: nil

M. Rahija

- he has read the comments

L. Gaddy
(Committee Member)

- the Committee just denied an application where the structure was twice the size allowed; he thinks this is a similar situation
- the sketch is hard to understand but it looks like it's going to be 19' high
- there is also another 16' x 24' building for storage
- recently the Committee denied an application on Woodburn Road for the storage of vehicles
- he wants to know why staff is supporting this

R. Ferrari
(staff)

- the existing 20' x 25' building is being demolished
- they are replacing something that is currently there with something that's a little bigger
- the information provided to staff satisfied their requirements

L. Gaddy
(Committee Member)

- it's more than double what is currently there

M. Rahija

- he has a trailer and classic cars
- he needs to keep them under locked storage for insurance purposes
- he also has a 20' long boat
- he doesn't like having everything all over the property
- he thought if he took down the 20' x 50' building that he could add that on to what he could build

GL/A-17:368
Page 2

- N. Mleczko
(Committee Member) - questioned if there is a variance required for the height
- R. Ferrari
(staff) - they are permitted 6m so whether it's 12' or 15' they still comply
- D. Serwatak
(Committee Member) - if approved he would like a condition added that the existing 20' x 50' and 24' x 16' buildings be demolished
- M. Rahija - the 24' x 16' building is staying
- P. Mallard
(Committee Member) - he's having a hard time differentiating between this and the previous one
- the house is only 1,300 sq. ft. and he has over 3,000 sq. ft. of accessory storage
- he's having a hard time figuring where the break line is for a minor variance
- V. Abraham
(Committee Member) - each application needs to be looked at on its own merits

Following discussion it was moved by Mr. Abraham and seconded by Ms. Mleczko that the application be granted.

Mr. Serwatak supported the motion to grant the application.

Mr. Pearce, Mr. Mallard, Mr. Smith, Mr. Gaddy and Ms. Smith voted in opposition to the motion to grant the application.

MOTION DEFEATED.

Moved by Mr. Mallard and seconded by Mr. Pearce that the relief requested 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.

Mr. Smith, Mr. Gaddye & Ms. Smith voted in support of the motion to deny the application.

Mr. Abraham, Ms. Mleczko & Mr. Serwatak voted in opposition to the motion to deny the application.

MOTION CARRIED.

NOTE: The Secretary-Treasurer advised that he received a call from the Building Division, Zoning Section, stating that the variance should have been to By-Law 05-200 not 464 as stated on the notice.

The Decision needs to be amended to reflect the correct By-Law number.

Moved by Mr. Mallard and seconded by Mr. Pearce that the application be **AMENDED** to reflect By-Law 05-200.

CARRIED.