



**TOWNSHIP OF MELANCTHON - ELECTRONIC MEETING
COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT - THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020 - 6:00 P.M.**

(For information on how to join the meeting, please go to the Council Meetings page on the Township Website to find the link, meeting code and password)

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 16, 2020

Motion - that the minutes of the Committee of Adjustment Meeting held on July 16, 2020 be approved as circulated.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

3. APPLICATION FOR CONSENT

4. APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE

5. APPLICATIONS ON FILE

1. B1/19 & B2/19 - Angelo Carnevale - Applications for Consent - Part of the East Part Lot 13, Concession 2 O.S. & East Part Lot 13, Concession 2 O.S.
2. B3/20 - Adam H. Vander Zaag Farms Ltd - Application for Consent - Part Lot 296 & 297, Concession 3 S.W.
 1. Comments from Harvey Lyon
 2. Decision Motion
3. B5/20 - Allen Clark - Application for Consent - Part of East Part of Lot 2, Concession 1 O.S., Part 1, RP 7R-6636

6. DELEGATES

7. CORRESPONDENCE

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion - That we adjourn Committee of Adjustment at _____ p.m. to meet again on Thursday, September 17, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. or at the call of the Chair.

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2020

By hand
Aug 10/20

To: Mayor White & Members of Council
From: Heather Lyon
Date: August 10
Subject: Vancouver Application for Severance.

I attempted to connect for the last council meeting - unsuccessful.
I will try again, with some tutoring, for the August meeting. In the
mean time it's back to the wobbly pen.

I request that consent to this application be denied. This
position is based on the following considerations.

If we look back to the PPS 2005 section 2.3.4.1C where
the provisions respecting lot creation for a residence
surplus to a farming operation are set out, there is no
restrictive language respecting the condition of the residence
nor the size of the lot. During the PPS review period
(2010+) there was chatter about tar-paper sheds
being severed under this provision with the bulldozers
arriving the day after the consent was given. Clearly
the 'surplus residence' provisions were being used in
such instances as a simple ticket to a new residential
building lot on Agricultural lands. This, clearly, was not
consistent with the over-arching intent of the PPS
to severely restrict residential lot creation on Agricultural
lands.

The PPS2014 introduced restrictive language. The residence must be "habitable". Although 'habitable' is not defined, most municipalities have property standard by-laws, or the equivalent, by which to make a clear assessment. Does the residence meet an acceptable standard at present and the condition is such that it can reasonably be expected to function as an acceptable residence for some time? The expectation of time here is important. If it is just a year or two we are basically back to 2005. Essentially the assessment must be that the 'surplus residence' is worth preserving.

Landscape submission in support of the application.

Page 5 Ms Walton states "At each level... there is permission in the policies for severance of a dwelling that is rendered surplus..." This statement completely ignores the requirement that the 'surplus residence' must exist and must be of a condition that it merits preserving.

Page 8 Ms Walton states "By removing the house because of its state of ^{dis}repair, these conditions changed. However what has not changed is compliance with the intent of the policy." No, the intent of the policy is to restrict severances to only those existing 'surplus residences' that are of an acceptable condition that the residence merits preserving.

Page 9 The scenario presented here—building a new house and then severing, is simply not relevant. The issue is whether the current application is consistent with the PPS and our OP.

I see the key points as follows

- The PPS severely restricts the creation of residential lots on agricultural lands
- The only type of new residential lot permitted on Agricultural lands is a lot which accommodates an existing 'surplus farm residence'. The condition of the existing farm residence must be such that it merits preservation.
- No evidence has been presented that would indicate that the condition of the residence, before demolition, was such that it merited preservation. To the contrary, Ms Walton states, Page 5, "the original house was in serious disrepair", and the applicant signed the Demolition Permit thus clearly indicating that it was not worth preserving.

Based on the above, I request that consent to this application be denied. Further, I request that I be informed of Council's decision by E-mail.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]