



Minutes

The Blue Mountains, Committee of Adjustment

Date: November 19, 2025
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Location: Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual Meeting
32 Mill Street, Thornbury ON
Prepared by: Carrie Fairley, Secretary-Treasurer

Members Present: Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, Robert Waind

Staff Present: Manager of Community Planning, Shawn Postma, Deputy Chief Building Official, Nancy Laythorpe and Planner, Manuel Riveria

A. Call to Order

A.1 Traditional Territory Acknowledgement

We would like to begin our meeting by recognizing the First Nations, Metis and Inuit peoples of Canada as traditional stewards of the land. The municipality is located within the boundary of Treaty 18 region of 1818 which is the traditional land of the Anishnaabek, Haudenosaunee and Wendat-Wyandot-Wyandotte peoples.

A.2 Committee Member Attendance

Chair Oliver called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. The Secretary-Treasurer Carrie Fairley noted all members were present, in Council Chambers.

A.3 Approval of Agenda

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Michael Martin

THAT the Agenda of November 19, 2025, be approved as circulated, including any additions to the agenda including the addition under Agenda Item C.1 regarding OLT update from Staff

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

A.4 Declaration of pecuniary interest and general nature thereof

NOTE: In accordance with the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*, the Town Committee of Adjustment By-Law 2024-04, and the Town Procedural By-law 2023-62, Committee of Adjustment Committee Members must file a written statement of the interest and its general nature with the Clerk for inclusion on the Registry.

Member McKinlay declared a conflict on Agenda Item C.1 due to his employment with Great Gulf Developers.

A.5 Previous Minutes

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

THAT the Minutes of October 22, 2025, be approved as circulated, including any revisions to be made.

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

A.6 Business Arising from Previous Minutes

None

B. Public Meeting

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario's Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA). The Corporation of the Town of The Blue Mountains wishes to inform the public that all information including opinions, presentations, reports and documentation provided for or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record. This information may be posted on the Town's website and/or made available to the public upon request.

B.1 Minor Variance Application No. A24-2025

Owner: Leanne and Darryl Weir

Applicant/Agent: Kristine Loft, Loft Planning Inc.

Municipal Address: Part Lot 17, Concession 4

Legal Description: CON 4 S PT LOT

Agenda item B.1 and B.2 were considered together.

Chair Oliver read aloud the Public Meeting Notice, and the Secretary-Treasurer confirmed that the Public Hearing Notice was circulated in accordance with the Planning Act by pre-paid first-class mail and was posted on-site on the subject lands. The Secretary-Treasurer provided a summary of all written comments received as a result of the Public Notice. Planning Staff then provided an overview of the review and why they are making the recommendations contained in the Staff Recommendation Report.

Chair Oliver spoke regarding the retained parcel and questioned if the property owner of the retained parcel would have the right to erect a residence on that piece of land. Manuel confirmed they would have that opportunity. Chair Oliver further questioned if a secondary residence could also be constructed on the retained parcel, under the new Planning Act rules which Manuel also confirmed. Chair Oliver spoke regarding the severed parcel noting it is .8 hectares and questioned if it is deemed large enough to accommodate an additional accessory dwelling as well. Manuel noted that is correct, as long as it maintains the zoning provisions associated with additional residential units. Manuel further noted that if an additional unit was proposed and it is not meeting one of the requirements of the zoning bylaw, they maybe planning reliefs.

Kristine Loft, Loft Planning, Agent for the Applicants provided an overview of her presentation providing support of the proposed application.

Chair Oliver then opened the public portion of the hearing and asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak to the application.

As there was no one else in attendance to speak in favour of or in opposition to the proposal, Chair Oliver closed the public meeting.

Moved by: Duncan McKinlay

Seconded by: Michael Martin

THAT the Committee of Adjustment receive Staff Report PBS.25.109, entitled "Recommendation Report – Consent Application B11-2025 and Minor Variance A24-2025 – Part Lot 17, Concession 4 (Weir);"

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

AND THAT the Committee of Adjustment GRANT a minor variance for A24-2025 subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site development be constructed in a manner substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan; and
2. That this is for the purpose of obtaining a building permit and is only valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of decision. Should a building permit not be issued by the Town within two years, the Minor Variance shall expire on November 19, 2027.

AND THAT the Committee of Adjustment GRANT Provisional Consent to Application B11-2025, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Owner meets all the requirements of the Town, financial or otherwise, for the Certificate of Consent to be issued;
2. That the Owner provide payment of cash-in-lieu of applicable parkland dedication and Development Charges, as required by the Town;
3. That the Owner provides a description of the land which can be registered in the Land Registry Office;
4. That all above conditions be fulfilled within two years of the Notice of Decision so that the Secretary-Treasurer or Town Clerk are authorized to issue the Certificate of Consent pursuant to Section 53(42) of the Planning Act.

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

B.2 Consent Application No. B11-2025

Owner: Leanne and Darryl Weir

Applicant/Agent: Kristine Loft, Loft Planning Inc.

Municipal Address: Part Lot 17, Concession 4

Legal Description: CON 4 S PT LOT

Agenda item B.1 and B.2 were considered together.

B.3 Minor Variance Application No. A23-2025

Owner: Jack Styrac

Applicant/Agent: Krystin Rennie, Georgian Planning Solutions

Municipal Address: 495970 Grey Road 2

Legal Description: PLAN 114 PT LOTS 1,2 RP 16R2424 PART 1

Chair Oliver read aloud the Public Meeting Notice, and the Secretary-Treasurer confirmed that the Public Hearing Notice was circulated in accordance with the Planning Act by pre-paid first-class mail and was posted on-site on the subject lands. The Secretary-Treasurer provided a summary of all written comments received as a result of the Public Notice. Planning Staff noted an error in the recommendation report whereas the proposal is noted as a hotel when it should be a motel. Planning Staff then provided an overview of the review and why they are making the recommendations contained in the Staff Recommendation Report.

Member McKinlay spoke regarding comments received about this proposal being appropriate in this particular zone and questioned when the decision was made that this zone is appropriate for this use, and was it done through a public process. Manuel noted the applicant went through a pre-consultation with the Town in 2023 outlining the proposal and received the requirements needed to receive the planning relief that is being requested. Member McKinlay further noted that previous update to the Town's Official Plan changed the sections that would allow for a motel in a hamlet area.

Member McKinlay questioned if it has been previously approved by Council that new developments are able to use holding tanks instead of a septic tank or connection to a sanitary sewer. Nancy Laythorpe, Deputy Chief Building Official noted that decision is not empowered by Council and is pursuant to the Building Code. Nancy further noted that there are certain provisions in the Building Code that allow you to build with a holding tank and noted there was a septic permit issued last year.

The Committee and staff further discussed the use of a holding tank, the provisions of the building code regarding holding tanks and when the Ministry of Environment is involved.

Member Pratt noted her experience as a landscape architecture and designing parking lots and questioned why they are using the standard setbacks and what the purpose is for. Manuel noted the purpose of the setbacks is to ensure mitigation of any noise, visible lighting, and ensures an adequate buffering between a residential zone and a commercial zone, depending on the use of the property. Manuel noted that depending on how people park which could be in the driveway facing the adjacent residential

dwelling or park behind the building. Manuel further noted the intent and purpose behind the planting strips is to ensure that there is adequate buffering, which will depend on the combination of planting strips. Manuel noted they are proposing opaque trees throughout the property which will be dense, or a combination of opaque trees and fencing to ensure that the screening will be minimal. Member Pratt questioned if there is enough space and noted a full height eastern white cedar, as noted in the report is 60 feet high and 30 feet wide. Manuel noted that is what was proposed on the site plan. Member Pratt reiterated the size of the proposed trees and questioned how a 1.8 metre setback is enough space, especially if a wooden fence is proposed to be erected in the same area. Member Pratt noted standards are in place for a reason. Manuel noted due to the configuration of the property, if they put three metres on both sides, it would result in a more congested narrow driveway and that is the reason for the proposed 1.8 metre setback, to accommodate parking along with the proposed drive aisle. Member Pratt noted it is already congested in this configuration, and the depth is the concern. Member Pratt further noted the proposal is not as deep as a pickup truck and is about a metre and a half short of the length of a pickup truck, and it is only just as wide as a pickup truck. Member Pratt noted it is already so congested that the number one parking space will not be able to get out of that parking space unless they back up, onto the street and further noted there is no room to back up and turn around and go out the proper way. Member Pratt continued questioning if two pickup trucks could even pass themselves in the proposed space noting it is 45 feet wide and a very narrow space. Member Pratt suggested this property was not meant for the use that is being proposed, and we are trying to cram an idea into a space that can not accommodate it. Member Pratt further questioned why when there are perfectly good regulations to help make this decision. Chair Oliver noted the reason for the buffer because the parking spaces are perpendicular to the property boundary and headlights would shine directly through that property boundary unless there is a buffer there. Member Pratt clarified that she was referring to both sides because neither side works and noted there is no room to put cedars where they are proposing. Member Pratt further expressed her concerns regarding the parking in this application including the lack of visual site lights.

Chair Oliver questioned under the Town's by-law how many parking spaces are required for this application. Manuel confirmed that the required parking is four spaces for the motel, one for barrier free parking and two for the existing forge.

Krystin Rennie, Agent for the application provided an overview of her presentation.

Member Pratt further noted her concerns and questioned why these standards are in place but not followed.

Member Pratt questioned the use of the property suggesting it is not a motel but apartments. Nancy noted that under the Building Act, a hotel, motel or apartment are all considered residential construction.

Member McKinlay noted the Ravenna Forge is designated as a heritage building and questioned if that protects it in the future from being demolished in the favour of seven more motel units. Manuel noted that the forge is to remain and since this building is of historical significance, it is to remain as is. Member McKinlay clarified that the forge can not be removed but can be maintained and improved consistently with this heritage architecture. Manuel confirmed that is correct.

Member Martin questioned how this application meets the requirements on how it is minor. Krystin spoke regarding the four tests, and noted there is a landscape buffer, and there are options to work with the neighbours for tree planting. Krystin noted it fulfills the intent and purpose of both the official plan and the zoning bylaw, permitted uses. Krystin further noted they can not move the forge and therefore can not change the width of that particular entrance point, but it is still useable. Krystin noted with respect to the other minor variants in the landscape, there are other opportunities to move forward with. Krystin noted the property owners have spoken with the neighbours and they requested a combination of landscaping and fence. Member Martin further noted that the Committee has to be satisfied that the application is minor in nature and noted his perspective and given the comments from other members of the Committee, he does not perceive it to be minor in nature.

Member Pratt questioned where the applicants are planning to store snow in the winter. Krystin noted either off site or in the back of the property. Member Pratt noted that is where the tanks are located and questioned how that impacts the tanks.

Jack Styrac, owner, noted the snow will be stored to the left of the property and the tanks they are installing can take the weight of vehicles. Member Pratt questioned if the tanks will be underground, which Jack confirmed. Jack further noted that because of the nature of the lot, this is what they could work with. Jack noted for the planting strip, they would be agreeable to erect a fence instead of trees and further noted light from headlights will not shine through a fence and will open the driveway further.

Chair Oliver spoke regarding fencing instead of vegetation and questioned if opaque fencing is part of their buffer. Krystin noted the plan is fence the entire property and noted it is partially fenced now. Jack noted he has spoken with the neighbours regarding fencing, but it has not been erected yet, but they will install a fence.

Chair Oliver then opened the public portion of the hearing and asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak to the application.

Stuart Taylor, Ravenna Resident provided comments noting his concerns with offset on the sewage tank and questioned how it would effect his and his neighbours water source and noted if trucks have the option to park on top of the tanks, what happens if a tank is crusted and causes a sewage leak, will the neighbours wells be effected. Stuart further expressed his concerns regarding snow removal and noted Ravenna is not a great spot for loading snow. Stuart noted his concerns regarding children playing in the area and the security of the motel. Krystin noted there are regulations and setbacks based on existing infrastructure in the area that they must adhere to. Chair Oliver noted that the Building department will ensure appropriate setbacks relative to septic systems in accordance with the Building Code. Chair Oliver spoke regarding the snow removal concerns noting it is in the property owner's best interest to have a plan to deal with eh snow.

Jon McKinlay, Ravenna Resident noted his support of the proposal and questioned if it is a mandatory requirement to have a planting strip versus an opaque fence. Shawn Postma, Manager of Community Planning noted a planting strip is defined in the Town's zoning by-law and means an area of land that is used exclusively for landscaping and may be crossed by driveways and walkways. Shawn further noted it is meant to be in a vegetative state, three meters wide and there is no requirement for opaque fencing or trees, it is just to remain green open space. Jon questioned why there is a requirement for a planting strip in this specific area of the property. Shawn noted when in a residential zone abutting a commercial zone, there is a minimum three metre, essentially green space between the properties. Shawn further noted that regardless of what is planted or if a fence is erected, in order to meet the requirements of the by-law, the planting strip just needs to be three metres of lawn.

As there was no one else in attendance to speak in favour of or in opposition to the proposal, Chair Oliver closed the public meeting.

Member Waind referred to the staff report and noted the report was silent with respect to the general intent and purpose of the official plan, with tourism related compatible uses keeping with the character and scale, and further noted that motels are permitted as long as there is compliance with Section B 2.5(1) regarding short term accommodation uses as outlined in Section B. Member Waind noted the use of a motel is a permitted as of right, but it must in keeping with the other development criteria. Member Waind further noted there are a couple of minor variance considerations, but the application begs the whole issue of this development being small scale, commercial

in nature, on a relatively small lot, on a holding tank, which is iffy at best. Member Waind noted this proposal will have a tremendous impact on the surrounding lands. Member Waind clarified that the staff report does not address the issue of how this proposal complies with the short-term accommodation provisions which are almost identical to a hotel or motel under Section B 4.5(3), and how those will be accommodated. Member Waind noted his understanding that any such proposal for short term accommodation, among other things, as per the Town policy, must be on full municipal services.

Krystin noted that the minor variance is for the two items requested and not the use of the land.

Member Pratt reiterated that she does not feel these minor variance requests are not minor, especially when considering larger vehicles.

The Committee further discussed the merits of the application including if there is adequate sewer and water.

Shawn noted the policy sections of the official plan regarding tourist accommodation uses does ensure they are at a scale and a size that is appropriate for the land, that they are properly managed in terms of being able to reduce nuisances like garbage, noise, etc. Shawn further noted those policies are there so a motel would be operated in a way that is going to remain consistent with the property. Shawn noted the application that has been submitted is just for the two required variances, one is for the width to the planting strip, and the second one is the width to the drive aisle. The use itself is identified as permitted under both the zoning bylaw and the official plan and does fit in with the policies of the Hamlet area. Shawn noted the additional concerns of the committee such as parking, placement of trees, etc., will be reviewed as part of the site plan review process and that process does not begin until the committee grants a decision on the variance requests.

Member Waind questioned how a three storey, or two and a half storey motel fits with the scale of development to meet the criteria for short-term accommodation uses.

There were technical issues at this meeting, where virtual attendees were not able to be heard in Council Chambers. Richard Bowering, Resident, attended virtually and was unable to provide his comments during the meeting. Chair Oliver allowed Carrie, Secretary-Treasurer to read Richard's comments on his behalf.

Richard's comments were that the committee has done a great job of covering some points he wished to raise and noted it is confusing the provincial guidelines of what constitutes a motel or a hotel or a condominium. The hotel is six units or more. When

you add cooking facilities, et cetera, it reads like an apartment or condominium development. The guidelines vary considerably for each.

Member Martin noted the reduction of the sideyard is 30%, and is significant.

Moved by: Duncan McKinlay

Seconded by: Michael Martin

THAT the Committee of Adjustment receive Staff Report PBS.25.108, entitled “Recommendation Report – Minor Variance A23-2025 – 495970 Grey Rd 2 (2722809 Ontario Inc.)”;

Yay (3): Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, and Robert Waind

Nay (2): Michael Martin, and Jan Pratt

The motion is Carried (3 to 2)

Moved by: Duncan McKinlay

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

AND THAT the Committee of Adjustment GRANT Application for Minor Variance A23-2025 in to permit the construction of a 74.77 m² three-storey, three-unit motel with a portion of a 1.8 m wide planting strip located where a commercial zone abuts a residential zone and a portion of a two-way aisle to be 4 m wide, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the site development be constructed in a manner substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan;
2. That the owner submit and obtain approval of a Site Plan Control Application prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; and
3. That this is for the purpose of obtaining a building permit and is only valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of decision. Should a building permit not be issued by the Town within two years, the Minor Variance shall expire on November 19, 2027.

Yay (2): Duncan McKinlay, and Jim Oliver

Nay (3): Michael Martin, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Lost (2 to 3)

Member Waind noted his concerns regarding the entire aspect of the application and did not consider the matter minor in nature, as set out in the criteria as so, eloquently set out in the DeGasperis Case.

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

THAT the Committee of Adjustment REFUSES Minor Variance Application A23-2025 as the Committee is not satisfied that the requested variances are minor in nature

Yay (3): Michael Martin, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

Nay (2): Duncan McKinlay, and Jim Oliver

The motion is Carried (3 to 2)

B.4 Minor Variance Application No. A25-2025

Owner: Eldano Properties Inc.

Applicant/Agent: Abbey Scott, First Step Building Consultants

Municipal Address: 82 Baring Street

Legal Description: TOWN PLOT PARK PT LOT 17 RP 16R1709 PART 1

Chair Oliver read aloud the Public Meeting Notice, and the Secretary-Treasurer confirmed that the Public Hearing Notice was circulated in accordance with the Planning Act by pre-paid first-class mail and was posted on-site on the subject lands. The Secretary-Treasurer provided a summary of all written comments received as a result of the Public Notice. Planning Staff then provided an overview of the review and why they are making the recommendations contained in the Staff Recommendation Report.

Shannon Dougherty, First Step Building Consultants and Agent for the Applicant attended virtually to provide comments in support of the application. Unfortunately, due to technical difficulties, the Committee was not able to hear the comments from Shannon, but we able to confirm that the applicant has no issues with staff's recommendation.

Chair Oliver then opened the public portion of the hearing and asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak to the application.

As there was no one else in attendance to speak in favour of or in opposition to the proposal, Chair Oliver closed the public meeting.

Member Waind noted his concerns for potential extra expenses that could be incurred by the applicant by the Committee including the requirement of a Grey Sauble permit.

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

THAT the Committee of Adjustment receive Staff Report PBS.25.110, entitled “Recommendation Report – Minor Variance Application A25-2025 – 82 Baring St (Eldano Properties Ltd.)”;

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Michael Martin

AND THAT the Committee of Adjustment GRANT Application for Minor Variance A25-2025 in order to permit the construction of a 39.02 m² carport that will be attached to the existing detached garage.

1. That the site development be constructed in a manner substantially in accordance with the submitted site plan;
2. That a permit from Grey Sauble Conservation Authority be obtained, if necessary; and
3. That this is for the purpose of obtaining a building permit and is only valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of decision. Should a building permit not be issued by the Town within two years, the shall expire on November 19, 2027.

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)

C. Other Business

C.1 Lora Bay Sales Centre OLT Appeal update

The Committee Members and Planning Staff discussed the process and requirements for a Municipal Submission to the OLT when an appeal of this Committee’s decision is received.

D. Committee Member Expenses

The Committee Members provided their travel expenses to the subject properties, to the Secretary-Treasurer.

E. Notice of Meeting Date

December 17, 2025

Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual

January 21, 2026

Town Hall, Council Chambers and Virtual

F. Adjournment

Moved by: Robert Waind

Seconded by: Jan Pratt

THAT the Committee of Adjustment does now adjourn at 3:20 p.m. to meet again at the call of the Chair.

Yay (5): Michael Martin, Duncan McKinlay, Jim Oliver, Jan Pratt, and Robert Waind

The motion is Carried (5 to 0)