

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

MINUTES

December 10, 2025

HYBRID MEETING:	Held on December 10, at 5:30 P.M, Council Chambers and Webinar	
PRESENT:	F. Capuano	- Chair
	J. Riddell	- Vice Chair
	V. Tinti	- Member
	B. Ursel	- Member
	E. Westerhof	- Member
	C. Susidko-Petriczko	- Secretary-Treasurer
	E. Shacklette	- Committee Clerk
	A. D'Angelo	- Supervisor, Planning Services and CofA
	J. O'Reilly	- Supervisor of Site Plan Review
	Magda Rusin-Hynek	- Planner, Site Plan Review
ABSENT:	A. Rawlings	- Alt. Member (1)
	P. Calleja	- Alt. Member (2)

1. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST:** None.

2. **ADDENDUMS:** None.

3. **REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS:** None.

4. **CONSENT ITEMS:**

HEARING NO.	FILE NO. 540-02-	ADDRESS
4.1)	A-062/25	Re: 517 Mayzel Rd., Burlington Ward 2 Pages 1-4
4.2)	A-072/25	Re: 2380 Sinclair Cir., Burlington Ward 3 Pages 5-7

5. REGULAR ITEMS:

HEARING NO.	FILE NO. 540-02-	ADDRESS
5.1)	A-015/25	Re: 4903 Thomas Alton Blvd., Burlington Ward 6 Pages 8-12
5.2)	A-046/25	Re: 2160 Lakeshore Rd., Burlington Ward 2 Pages 13-16

6. OTHER BUSINESS:

- 6.1 Correspondence
- 6.2 Items for Discussion
- 6.3 Date of Next Meeting
- 6.4 Approval of Minutes from the previous Committee of Adjustment meeting

7. ADJOURNMENT:

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

Chair called the Committee of Adjustment meeting no. 22 to order at 5:30 pm.

Secretary Treasurer provided introductory remarks; Committee Clerk advised of housekeeping items.

- 1. DECLARATION OF INTEREST:** None.
- 2. ADDENDUMS:** None.
- 3. DEFERRALS:** None.
- 4. CONSENT ITEMS:**

Secretary Treasurer invited the public if they wished to speak to an item on the Consent Agenda; None.

Chair invited the Committee Members if they wished to pull an item from the Consent Agenda; None.

HEARING NO. 3 - FILE NO. 540-02-A-062/25

APPLICANTS: Scott Ryan Andrew Tilley,
Lauren Michelle Tilley

PROPERTY: 517 Mayzel Rd.,
PLAN 594 LOT 18,
City of Burlington, Regional Municipality of Halton.

HAVING REVIEWED an application by the Owners of the above described property, for a Minor Variance to the requirements of the Zoning By-Law 2020, as amended, as follows:

- 1. To permit a south side yard of 1.6 m instead of the minimum required 1.8 m for a proposed second storey addition.
- 2. To permit lot coverage of 29% instead of the maximum permitted 25% for a proposed second storey addition onto an existing detached dwelling with attached garage.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

PRESENT:	Max Fedchyshak of NPG Planning Solution – Agent
MATERIALS:	Staff reports containing advice of Planning Department – (Committee of Adjustment, Zoning, Site Planning, and Building) Site Engineering, and Transportation Services.
EVIDENCE:	Notice of Legislative Compliance
HEARING:	Started at approximately 5:40 pm

This application was placed onto the Consent Agenda for the following reasons: There was no public opposition as a result of the public notice, staff and agencies supported the application, and there were no requests to delegate to this matter.

Chair asked the Committee for a Motion. Member Riddell moved for approval with condition; Member Westerhof seconded.

Chair turned to Committee for Comments; None.

There was no public opposition as a result of the public notice, staff and agencies supported the application, and there were no requests to delegate to this matter; Committee, having reviewed this information, considered that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* for similar reasons as the staff report in the agenda.

Chair called a vote; Members unanimously supported the application and therefore the decision was carried; application was approved, and the decision was now in the 20 day appeal period. The Secretary Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

DECISION 540-02-A-062/2025:

Having regard for the requirements of Section 45 Sub-section (1) of the *Planning Act*, RSO. 1990, c. P.13, as amended;

And after having fully considered as part of their deliberations and final decision on this matter any and all written submissions relating to this application that were made to the Committee of Adjustment before its decision, and any and all oral submission related to this application that were made at the public hearing held under the *Planning Act*; **members unanimously supported the application and therefore;**

The Committee **GRANTS** the application under **File 540-02-A-062/2025** at **517 Mayzel Rd., Burlington:**

1. To permit a south side yard of 1.6 m instead of the minimum required 1.8 m for a proposed second storey addition.
2. To permit lot coverage of 29% instead of the maximum permitted 25% for a proposed second storey addition onto an existing detached dwelling with attached garage.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

MinutesDecember 10, 2025

The reasons for the Committee's decision are that:

1. The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan **will** be maintained.
2. The general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law **will** be maintained.
3. The requested variances **are** desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property.
4. The requested variances **are** minor.

In addition to satisfying the four tests, the Committee's rationale for supporting the application include: the proposed variances were minor, involving only a 0.2 m reduction in the side yard setback and a 4% increase in lot coverage; taken together, the cumulative effect was modest, facilitating a small-scale addition within the existing building footprint while maintaining the area's low-rise residential character; the addition did not result in unacceptable impacts related to massing, scale, privacy, or shadowing, and it preserved adequate open space for drainage, landscaping, and amenity; overall, the variances did not undermine the intent of the Zoning By-law and resulted in appropriate, compatible development.

CONDITIONS:

The decision of the subject minor variance application is subject to the following conditions. Conditions as listed below must be fulfilled within the time period specified which period begins from the last date of appeal. Any time period given is a maximum period only and cannot be extended.

These variances are for the life and repair of the single detached residential use only; any construction associated with this approval shall be substantially in accordance with the plans submitted in support of the application.

The following conditions must be satisfied within 2 years for the subject site:

1. The Applicant shall apply for a Pre-Building Permit Application.

The Applicant is advised of the following notes:

1. A building permit is required for all construction.
2. Permit application drawings are to be prepared by a qualified designer as per Div. C., Section 3.2 - Qualifications of Designers and OBC 2024.
3. A grading and drainage clearance certificate may be required.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

-
4. A tree permit will be required for any and all work around regulated trees in accordance with the City's Tree By-laws. Revisions to the report and/or plans may be required through the tree permit process.

The decision of the Committee is subject to a 20-day appeal period that starts today. The Secretary-Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

* * * *

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

HEARING NO. 4.2 - FILE NO. 540-02-A-072/25

APPLICANTS: Trevor McCalpin,
Erin Michelle McCalpin

PROPERTY: 2380 Sinclair Cir.,
PLAN 1525 LOT 216,
City of Burlington, Regional Municipality of Halton.

HAVING REVIEWED an application by the Owners of the above described property, for a Minor Variance to the requirements of the Zoning By-Law 2020, as amended, as follows:

1. To permit a rear yard of 6.5 m instead of the minimum required 9 m for a proposed addition to a detached dwelling with attached garage.
2. To permit a dwelling depth of 19.3 m instead of the maximum permitted 18 m measured from building wall closest to front lot line to the building wall closest to the rear lot line for a proposed addition to a two-storey dwelling with attached garage.

PRESENT:	Trevor McCalpin and Erin Michelle McCalpin – Owners Khashayar(Kash) Lotfalian, Parsways Inc. – Agent
MATERIALS:	Staff reports containing advice of Planning Department – (Committee of Adjustment, Zoning, Site Planning, and Building) Site Engineering, and Transportation Services.
EVIDENCE:	None
HEARING:	Started at approximately 5:42 pm

This application was placed onto the Consent Agenda for the following reasons: There was no public opposition as a result of the public notice, staff and agencies supported the application, and there were no requests to delegate to this matter.

Chair asked the Committee for a Motion. Member Ursel moved for approval with condition; Member Riddel seconded.

Chair turned to Committee for Comments; None.

There was no public opposition as a result of the public notice, staff and agencies supported the application, and there were no requests to delegate to this matter; Committee, having reviewed this information, considered that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* for similar reasons as the staff report in the agenda.

Chair called a vote; Members unanimously supported the application and therefore the decision was carried; application was approved, and the decision was now in the 20 day

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

appeal period. The Secretary Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

DECISION 540-02-A-082/2025:

Having regard for the requirements of Section 45 Sub-section (1) of the *Planning Act*, RSO. 1990, c. P.13, as amended;

And after having fully considered as part of their deliberations and final decision on this matter any and all written submissions relating to this application that were made to the Committee of Adjustment before its decision, and any and all oral submission related to this application that were made at the public hearing held under the *Planning Act*; **members unanimously supported the application and therefore;**

The Committee **GRANTS** the application under **File 540-02-A-082/2025** at **2380 Sinclair Circle, Burlington:**

1. To permit a rear yard of 6.5 m instead of the minimum required 9 m for a proposed addition to a detached dwelling with attached garage.
2. To permit a dwelling depth of 19.3 m instead of the maximum permitted 18 m measured from building wall closest to front lot line to the building wall closest to the rear lot line for a proposed addition to a two-storey dwelling with attached garage.

The reasons for the Committee's decision are that:

1. The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan **will** be maintained.
2. The general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law **will** be maintained.
3. The requested variances **are** desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property.
4. The requested variances **are** minor.

In addition to satisfying the four tests, the Committee's rationale for supporting the application include: due to the varied building footprint with differing side and rear yard setbacks, the proposed variances did not result in overdevelopment of the site or compromise the intent of the Zoning By-law or Official Plan; collectively, they facilitated a modest 22.4 m² sunroom addition that preserved the existing tree canopy and maintained the usability of the rear yard open space; the single-storey sunroom addition was appropriately scaled and situated, ensuring that any visual or massing impacts were effectively mitigated.

CONDITIONS:

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

The decision of the subject minor variance application is subject to the following conditions. Conditions as listed below must be fulfilled within the time period specified which period begins from the last date of appeal. Any time period given is a maximum period only and cannot be extended.

These variances are for the life and repair of the single detached residential use only; any construction associated with this approval shall be substantially in accordance with the plans submitted in support of the application.

The following conditions must be satisfied within 2 years for the subject site:

1. The Applicant shall apply for a Pre-Building Permit.

The Applicant is advised of the following notes:

1. A building permit is required for all construction.
2. Permit application drawings are to be prepared by a qualified designer as per Div. C., Section 3.2 - Qualifications of Designers and OBC 2024.
3. A grading and drainage clearance certificate may be required.
4. A tree permit will be required for any and all work around regulated trees in accordance with the City's Tree By-laws. Revisions to the report and/or plans may be required through the tree permit process.
5. Variances have been identified based on the plans submitted for zoning review. If additional variances are identified when a Pre-Building Approval Application is made, they will be the responsibility of the applicant to obtain.
6. The zoning review is based on the portion of the site affected by the proposed development only.
7. The variances are being reviewed under Section 45(1) of the Planning Act.

The decision of the Committee is subject to a 20-day appeal period that starts today. The Secretary-Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

* * * *

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

1. REGULAR ITEMS:**HEARING NO. 5.1 - FILE NO. 540-02-A-015/25**

APPLICANT: CJJ HOLDINGS LIMITED

PROPERTY: 4903 Thomas Alton Blvd.,
 PLAN M1034 BLK 24,
 City of Burlington, Regional Municipality of Halton.

TO HEAR AND DETERMINE an application by the Owners of the above described property, for a Minor Variance to the requirements of the Zoning By-Law 2020, as amended, as follows:

1. To permit a 61m maximum yard abutting Thomas Alton Blvd instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.
2. To permit a 77m maximum yard abutting Appleby Line instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.
3. To permit a 12m maximum yard abutting Palladium Way instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.
4. To permit 3.65 parking spaces per 100m² of gross floor area instead of the minimum required 5 parking spaces per 100m² of gross floor area for a retail centre.
5. Notwithstanding Part 5, Section 4.13, to permit a building elevation facing a street (Thomas Alton Blvd) without pedestrian accessible doors associated with Building C, whereas Zoning By-Law 2020 requires a pedestrian accessible door on a building elevation facing a street for every building located within 60 metres of a street with a deemed width of 26 m or greater.
6. Notwithstanding Part 5, Section 4.13, to permit a building elevation facing a street (Palladium Way) without pedestrian accessible doors associated with Building C, whereas Zoning By-Law 2020 requires a pedestrian accessible door on a building elevation facing a street for every building located within 60 metres of a street with a deemed width of 26 m or greater.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

PRESENT:	Mark Yarranton, KLM Planning Partners Inc. – Agent
MATERIALS:	Staff reports containing advice of Planning Department – (Committee of Adjustment, Zoning, Site Planning, and Building) Site Engineering, and Transportation Services.
EVIDENCE:	Agent Presentation
HEARING:	Started at approximately 5:43 pm

Discussion:

Chair noted pertinent details outlined in the application and on the plans and evidence received.

Agent appeared on behalf of the owners and provided evidence in support of the application.

No one appeared before the Committee in support or opposition to the request.

Chair asked if any Members had any questions: J. Riddell and Chair asked questions of the agent and staff.

Comments from Committee:

Chair asked Members if they had comments on the application:

E. Westerhof supported the application; noted for the following reasons: Member appreciated the agent’s presentation and the information shared at the hearing; on the original application, the Member was able to support variances 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, but had concerns with variances 1 and 4; these concerns were addressed through the amended application, the additional information provided by the applicant, and the updated staff report; as the agent eliminated the need for a variance related to garbage storage, the Member was comfortable supporting all variances in their entirety, as amended.

B. Ursel supported the application; noted for the following reasons: the Member appreciated both the agent and staff for their collaboration on the application, noted that best planning practices had been observed; concurred with Member Westerhof and valued the added features that enhanced pedestrian experience and comfort; supported the full application, as it was found to meet the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

V. Tinti supported the application; noted for the following reasons: expressed full support for the amended application; appreciated the changes that addressed previous concerns, and concurred with the other Members and the staff report.

J. Riddell partially supported the application; noted for the following reasons: appreciated the applicant’s presentation and the amendments to the application; did not support variances 1 and 5, as the general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law were

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

not met; it was noted that Alton Village was designed to encourage pedestrian movement, and placing buildings close to the street did not achieve that objective; acknowledged that the site had previously received variances to reduce setbacks, bringing buildings closer to Appleby and Thomas Alton; while staff reports referenced numerical differences to evaluate whether a variance was “minor,” the proposal exceeded the standards of the by-law in his opinion; variances 1 and 5 were therefore not considered minor, did not meet the general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law, and, in the context of Alton Village, were not regarded as good development given the building’s distance from the street and lack of landscaping in between; supported variances 2, 3, 4, and 6 as they meet the four tests of the *Planning Act*

Chair supported the application; noted for the following reasons: acknowledged the difficulty in assessing the setbacks when reviewing the subject site holistically; agreed with the staff report and appreciated the agent’s presentation; further agreed that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Chair asked the Committee for a Motion for variances 1 and 5. Member Ursel moved for approval with condition; Member Westerhof seconded. Carried.

Chair asked the Committee for a Motion for variances 2, 3, 4 and 6. Member Ursel moved for approval with condition; Member Westerhof seconded. Carried.

Majority of Committee members voted that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* for similar reasons as the staff reports in the agenda and evidence presented at the hearing.

Chair read the decision; advised of the conditions and 20 day appeal period.

DECISION 540-02-A-015/2025:

Having regard for the requirements of Section 45 Sub-section (1) of the *Planning Act*, RSO. 1990, c. P.13, as amended;

And after having fully considered as part of their deliberations and final decision on this matter any and all written submissions relating to this application that were made to the Committee of Adjustment before its decision, and any and all oral submission related to this application that were made at the public hearing held under the *Planning Act*;

Majority of members supported the application therefore;

The Committee **GRANTS** the application under **File 540-02-A-015/2025** at **4903 Thomas Alton Blvd., Burlington:**

1. To permit a 61m maximum yard abutting Thomas Alton Blvd instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

-
2. To permit a 77m maximum yard abutting Appleby Line instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.
 3. To permit a 12m maximum yard abutting Palladium Way instead of the maximum permitted 6m for proposed Building C.
 4. To permit 3.65 parking spaces per 100m² of gross floor area instead of the minimum required 5 parking spaces per 100m² of gross floor area for a retail centre.
 5. Notwithstanding Part 5, Section 4.13, to permit a building elevation facing a street (Thomas Alton Blvd) without pedestrian accessible doors associated with Building C, whereas Zoning By-Law 2020 requires a pedestrian accessible door on a building elevation facing a street for every building located within 60 metres of a street with a deemed width of 26 m or greater.
 6. Notwithstanding Part 5, Section 4.13, to permit a building elevation facing a street (Palladium Way) without pedestrian accessible doors associated with Building C, whereas Zoning By-Law 2020 requires a pedestrian accessible door on a building elevation facing a street for every building located within 60 metres of a street with a deemed width of 26 m or greater.

The reasons for the Committee's decision are that:

1. The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan **will** be maintained.
2. The general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law **will** be maintained.
3. The requested variances **are** desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property.
4. The requested variances **are** minor.

In addition to satisfying the four tests, the Committee's rationale for supporting the application include: the variances were minor in nature as their approval resulted in limited adverse impacts; there were no aesthetic concerns arising from Building "C" not being located adjacent to Appleby Line, since Buildings "A" and "B" already engaged with the streetscape; the side elevations of Building "C" were attractive and featured usable doors that could be made publicly accessible in the future; positioned close to Palladium Way, the building was designed at a substantial scale that appropriately framed the street, while the restaurant patio activated the frontage within the required 6-metre setback, mitigating the distance from the building wall to the sidewalk; in addition, the proposed pergola and benches enhanced Thomas Alton Boulevard, supplementing the streetscape engagement already achieved by Building "B" in conformity with neighbourhood urban design guidelines.

CONDITIONS:

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

MinutesDecember 10, 2025

The decision of the subject minor variance application is subject to the following conditions. Conditions as listed below must be fulfilled within the time period specified which period begins from the last date of appeal. Any time period given is a maximum period only and cannot be extended.

These variances are for the life and repair of the single detached residential use only; any construction associated with this approval shall be substantially in accordance with the plans submitted in support of the application.

The following conditions must be satisfied within 2 years for the subject site:

1. The Applicant shall apply for a Zoning Clearance certificate.

The Applicant is advised of the following notes:

1. A building permit is required for all construction.
2. Permit application drawings are to be prepared by a qualified designer as per Div. C., Section 3.2 - Qualifications of Designers and OBC 2024.
3. Compliance with OBC Section 3.2.3 must be verified to ensure existing buildings remain in compliance, as the proposed property line impacts the limiting distance, which in turn affects spatial separation requirements.
4. Compliance with OBC Section 3.2.5 must be verified to ensure existing buildings remain in compliance, particularly where the proposed property line intersects or affects the existing fire route.
5. A grading and drainage clearance certificate may be required.
6. A tree permit may be required for any and all work around regulated trees in accordance with the City's Tree By-laws. Revisions to the report and/or plans may be required through the tree permit process.
7. The applicant may require a tree application permit and attendant documentation such as an arborist report and tree protection plan should any regulated trees be impacted following our public tree by-law.
8. Any impacts to private trees will be dealt with through the site plan process and public trees will require a permit should there be any impacts.
9. The application was reviewed under Section 45(1) of The Planning Act

The decision of the Committee is subject to a 20-day appeal period that starts today. The Secretary-Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

HEARING NO. 5.2 - FILE NO. 540-02-A-046/25

APPLICANT: 2160 Lakeshore (2024) Nominee Inc.

PROPERTY: 2160 Lakeshore Rd.,
PLAN 99 PT LOTS 98,99,
City of Burlington, Regional Municipality of Halton.

TO HEAR AND DETERMINE an application by the Owners of the above described property, for a Minor Variance to the requirements of the Zoning By-Law 2020, as amended, as follows:

1. To permit a maximum density of 218 units per hectare instead of the maximum permitted 185 units per hectare for a total of 161 residential dwelling units.
2. To permit an existing driveway to be set back 2.4m from a wall of a building containing windows of habitable rooms in dwelling units located on the ground floor instead of the minimum required 3m.

PRESENT:	Lance Kaprielian, Studio Limina Inc. – Agent
MATERIALS:	Staff reports containing advice of Planning Department – (Committee of Adjustment, Zoning, Site Planning, and Building) Site Engineering, and Transportation Services.
EVIDENCE:	None
HEARING:	Started at approximately 6:18 pm

Discussion:

Chair noted pertinent details outlined in the application and on the plans and evidence received.

Agent appeared on behalf of the owners and provided evidence in support of the application.

No one appeared before the Committee in support or opposition to the request.

Chair asked if any Members had any questions: E. Westerhof, B. Ursel, and V. Tinti asked questions of the agent and staff.

Comments from Committee:

Chair asked Members if they had comments on the application:

J. Riddell supported the application; noted for the following reasons: noted that, per the staff report and the visual provided, the building was not changing and therefore all

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

design considerations and official plan policies had been maintained; raised a question regarding parking spaces on site, observed that once the applicant proceeded with the building permit process, it was likely the matter would return before the Committee; based on the current proposal before the Committee, agreed that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* for similar reasons noted in the staff report.

V. Tinti supported the application; noted for the following reasons: agreed with the staff report and appreciated the agent's presentation; agreed that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

E. Westerhof supported the application; noted for the following reasons: appreciated the applicant's responses during the hearing and was supportive of the application based on the evidence contained in the application, the information submitted by the applicant at the hearing, the staff report, and the site inspection; agreed that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

B. Ursel supported the application; noted for the following reasons: concurred with the other Members and understood that variance 2 had been proposed to correct an existing situation on the subject site; based on the requirement for a parking study, the Member noted that the applicant might return before the Committee in the future; on the merits of the proposed application, the Member supported both variances as they met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Chair supported the application; noted for the following reasons: concurred with member comments and the staff report; agreed that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Chair asked the Committee for a Motion. Member Riddell moved for approval with condition; Member Westerhof seconded.

Committee members voted unanimously that the variance application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* for similar reasons as the staff reports in the agenda and evidence presented at the hearing.

Chair read the decision; advised of the conditions and 20 day appeal period.

DECISION 540-02-A-046/2025:

Having regard for the requirements of Section 45 Sub-section (1) of the *Planning Act*, RSO. 1990, c. P.13, as amended;

And after having fully considered as part of their deliberations and final decision on this matter any and all written submissions relating to this application that were made to the Committee of Adjustment before its decision, and any and all oral submission related to this application that were made at the public hearing held under the *Planning Act*;
Members unanimously supported the application and therefore;

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

The Committee **GRANTS** the application under **File 540-02-A-046/2025** at **2160 Lakeshore Road, Burlington**:

1. To permit a maximum density of 218 units per hectare instead of the maximum permitted 185 units per hectare for a total of 161 residential dwelling units.
2. To permit an existing driveway to be set back 2.4m from a wall of a building containing windows of habitable rooms in dwelling units located on the ground floor instead of the minimum required 3m.

The reasons for the Committee's decision are that:

1. The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan **will** be maintained.
2. The general intent and purpose of the zoning by-law **will** be maintained.
3. The requested variances **are** desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property.
4. The requested variances **are** minor.

In addition to satisfying the four tests, the Committee's rationale for supporting the application include: although the applicant requested an increase in density and to locate windows of a habitable room closer to a driveway, the unit was contained within the existing apartment building and adjacent to an existing driveway; the variances did not promote overbuilding of the site or development inconsistent with the intent of the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law, nor did they pose adverse effects to the subject property, adjacent properties, or the surrounding streetscape.

CONDITIONS:

The decision of the subject minor variance application is subject to the following conditions. Conditions as listed below must be fulfilled within the time period specified which period begins from the last date of appeal. Any time period given is a maximum period only and cannot be extended.

These variances are for the life and repair of the single detached residential use only; any construction associated with this approval shall be substantially in accordance with the plans submitted in support of the application.

The following conditions must be satisfied within 2 years for the subject site:

1. The Applicant shall apply for a Zoning Clearance certificate.

The Applicant is advised of the following notes:

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

MinutesDecember 10, 2025

1. A building permit is required for all construction.
2. Permit application drawings must be prepared by a qualified designer in accordance with Division C, Section 3.2 – Qualifications of Designers, and the applicable Ontario Building Code (OBC) requirements.
3. Compliance with OBC Part 4 must be validated to ensure structural adequacy of the building due to proposed work.
4. Compliance with OBC Section 3.2.5 must be verified to ensure existing buildings remain in compliance, particularly where the proposed property line intersects or affects the existing fire route.
5. A grading and drainage clearance certificate **may** be required.
6. A tree permit **will** be required for any and all work around regulated trees in accordance with the City's Tree By-laws. Revisions to the report and/or plans may be required through the tree permit process.
7. This application has been reviewed under Section 45 (1) of the Planning Act.
8. A designated accessible parking space is not required for one additional residential dwelling unit
9. The Architect is required to submit a letter confirming the total number of existing occupant and visitor parking spaces to demonstrate compliance with required parking, prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance Certificate. Additional variances may be required and will be the Applicant's responsibility to obtain.

The decision of the Committee is subject to a 20-day appeal period that starts today. The Secretary-Treasurer will mail a copy of the decision within 10 days of this meeting.

6. OTHER BUSINESS:**6.1 Correspondence:**

Copies of Minutes for Meeting No. 21 on November 19, 2025

6.2 Items for Discussion:**6.3 Date of Next Meeting:**

Wednesday, January 21, 2026 at 1:00 p.m., in person at City Hall in Council Chambers and virtually via Zoom Video Conferencing Technology.

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting 22

Minutes

December 10, 2025

6.4 Approval of Minutes:

After conferring with the Members, the Chair directed the minutes of November 19, 2025 be approved as distributed.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:38p.m.

CERTIFIED CORRECT



C. Susidko-Petriczko
Secretary-Treasurer

CONFIRMED



F. Capuano
Chair