



**CITY OF MARKHAM**  
**Virtual Meeting on Zoom**

**November 9, 2022**  
**7:00 pm**

**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

**Minutes**

The 20<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the Committee of Adjustment for the year 2022 was held at the time and virtual space above with the following people present:

Arrival Time

Tom Gutfreund, Acting Chair	7:00 PM
Arun Prasad	7:00 PM
Sally Yan	7:00 PM
Jeamie Reingold	7:00 PM
Patrick Sampson	7:00 PM

Shawna Houser, Secretary-Treasurer  
Greg Whitfield, Supervisor, Committee of Adjustment  
Bernie Tom, Development Technician, Zoning and Special Projects

**Regrets**

Gregory Knight, Chair  
Kelvin Kwok

**DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

**Minutes: October 19, 2022**

THAT the minutes of Meeting No. 19, of the City of Markham Committee of Adjustment, held October 19, 2022, respectively, be:

- a) Approved on November 09, 2022.

**Moved By: Arun Prasad**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

**Carried**

## **VALIDATION OF TITLE (SECTION 57 PLANNING ACT)**

### **1. B/024/22**

**Owner Name: Li-May Ong and Fon King Liu**  
**Agent Name: Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP (Kevin Dias)**  
**66 Barnstone Drive, Markham**  
**PLAN 65M4193 PT BLK 110 PLAN 65M4240 PT BLK 37 RP 65R32875 PTS**  
**12 AND 26**

The owners were requesting to obtain a Certificate of Validation in order that a contravention of Section 50 of the Planning Act or a predecessor of it, or of a by-law passed under a predecessor of Section 50, or an order made under clause 27(1)(b) of the Planning Act as it read on the 25th day of June, 1970, being chapter 296 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1960 or a predecessor of it, does not have and shall be deemed never to have had, the effect of preventing the conveyance of, or creation of any interest in the parcel of land described as follows:

- a) Part Block 110, Plan 65M4193, Part 12 65R32875; City of Markham, being all of PIN 03060-7555 (LT); and Part Block 37, Plan 65M4240, Part 26 65R32875; City of Markham, being all of PIN 03060-7557 (LT).

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Kevin Dias, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Yan recommended approval.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Arun Prasad**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/024/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

## **SECONDARY SUITES**

### **1. A/083/22**

**Owner Name: Nanthakumar Kathiravelu & Selvamalar Nanthakumar**  
**Agent Name: Juara Design Studio (Raj Balasundaram)**  
**14 Dynasty Drive, Markham**  
**PLAN 65M3551 LOT 65**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 90-81, as amended, to permit:

- a) **Amending By-law 51-94, Section 1.3(b):**  
an accessory dwelling unit, whereas the By-law permits no more than one dwelling unit on a lot.

as it related to a proposed secondary suite (basement apartment).

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Raj Balasundaram, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Sampson recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Patrick Sampson**  
**Seconded By: Arun Prasad**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/083/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**2. A/173/22**

**Owner Name: Bing Qian and Xia Zhang**  
**Agent Name: Markham Drafting & Design (Dongshan Cui)**  
**56 Col Marr Road, Markham**  
**PLAN 65M2522 LOT 6**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 118-79, as amended, to permit:

- a) **Section 6.1:**  
a second dwelling unit, whereas the By-law permits no more than one dwelling unit per lot.

as it related to a proposed secondary suite (basement apartment).

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The owner, Bing Qian, appeared on behalf of the application.

There were four letters of opposition received in response to the public notice.

Anthony Loh, 55 Col Mar Road, raised concerns that, in the past, the dwelling had been divided into multiple residential units without proper permissions, inspections or regard for safety. The property had been the subject of multiple safety, and nuisance complaints and the infrastructure was not upgraded for multiple units. Anthony indicated that the plans did not reflect the constructed interior and did not meet the intent of the Official Plan or Zoning By-law.

Catherine Gorman, 43 Col Mar Road, was concerned that the property would be utilized as a rooming house.

David Ryckman, 49 Col Mar Road, questioned how occupancy would be tracked.

The owner stated that past conditions had changed, their family occupied the upper unit, and they were aware of the previous safety and nuisance reports.

Member Prasad asked for clarification regarding the laundry area.

Member Yan thanked the residents for their participation. The member understood the property's history and that concerns were related to by-law enforcement. Based on the planning requirements, the member supported the application indicating it met the four tests of the *Planning Act* and recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/173/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

## **PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

### **1. A/051/22**

**Owner Name: Nichols Law Professional Corporation (Graham Nichols)**  
**Agent Name: Malone Given Parsons Ltd (Elyse Holwell)**  
**51 Main Street, Markham**  
**PLAN 18 BLK D PT LOT 9**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1229, as amended, to permit:

- a) **Section 7.1(b)(ii):**  
the use of a veterinary clinic, whereas the by-law does not permit this use; and

**b) Parking By-law 28-97, Section 8.2.1(b):**

4 parking spaces, whereas the by-law requires 6 parking spaces.

as it related to the proposed veterinary clinic.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Lincoln Lo, appeared on behalf of the application. Lincoln presented the project highlighting that with respect to land uses older by-laws did not prohibit these type of uses rather they had not been contemplated. Parking for the property had been assessed and there would be sufficient parking with the tandem spaces available as well as on street parking and summarized that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

One letter of support was received in response to the public notice

Kent Sorensen a Main Street business owner was in support of the application.

Member Sampson was familiar with the property and agreed with the staff report that the use was appropriate and supported the application.

Member Yan asked the applicant to explain how traffic flow would be handled on the property.

Lincoln Lo indicated that the parking and traffic flow had been assessed based on the business model of an owner operated clinic by appointment only. With a small staff and a combination of on-site and street parking, the traffic flow would be accommodated.

Member Reingold requested additional information regarding the clinics operation.

The Acting Chair summarized the application indicating it met local needs, was a good addition to the community, sufficient parking was available and the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Member Yan recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/051/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**2. A/040/22**

**Owner Name: Samia Sahyone**  
**Agent Name: MMK Engineering Inc. (Miral Hanna)**  
**20 Gainsville Avenue, Markham**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 11-72, as amended, to permit:

**a) Section 6.1:**

a minimum side yard setback of 4 feet 2 inches (1.27 metres), whereas the By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 6 feet (1.82 metres) for a two-storey building;

as it related to a proposed detached dwelling on the retained lot (Parts 8, 10, and 12).

This application was related to Consent Applications B/003/22 and B/006/22 which were approved by the Committee of Adjustment on August 10, 2022. Related Minor Variance applications A/031/22 and A/039/22, will be withdrawn.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Miral Hanna, appeared on behalf of the application. Miral indicated that the dwelling had to be redesigned to remove the additional variance requests. The remaining variance was required due to a hydro easement. The request for the reduced side yard was between the lots created through the consent. The variance was requested to allow the design of the house not to be overly narrow.

Christiane Bergauer-Free, 145 Krieghoff Avenue, indicated that concerns raised at the previous meeting still needed to be addressed. The application was not aligned with the Official Plan; the massing, lot coverage, second-storey balcony, and dwelling location negatively impacted surrounding properties.

Al and Barbara Pawlak, 16 Gainsville Avenue, asked regarding the applications for 18 and 18a Gainsville Avenue, as concerns regarding the hedge and drainage remained outstanding.

Miral Hanna responded that the development of 18 and 18a Gainsville Avenue was required to go through engineering approval, and the drainage between 18 and 16 Gainsville Avenue would be enhanced. Therefore, the hedge would not be adversely impacted.

The Acting Chair advised that the 18 and 18a Gainsville Avenue applications had been withdrawn. The dwellings would comply with the zoning standards, and the Committee would make no further comment.

Member Yan stated that the variances had been discussed extensively at the previous meeting. The applicants had redesigned to meet the zoning requirements on 18 and 18a Gainsville Avenue. The only variance under discussion was the side yard setback for 20 Gainsville Avenue. Member Yan indicated that considering the constraints of the existing easement, which would result in a narrow house that would impact the streetscape and the minor nature of the request, they supported the application.

Member Sampson agreed with Member Yan and stated that as the applicant had met the zoning standards on the other two lots, the design and drawings were not part of the discussion. The member indicated that the requested variance was reasonable.

Member Reingold indicated that she agreed with the neighbours that the design was still very similar to the previous meeting and, in their opinion, did not suit the community. However, they indicated that this was outside the Committee's control.

The Acting Chair reminded the community that the Committee did not have control over architectural design.

Member Yan indicated that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* and recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/040/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Applications B/020/22 and B/021/2022 were heard concurrently.**

**1. B/020/22**

**Owner Name: Paul Jamieson**  
**Agent Name: Minto Communities Inc. (Anderson Marques)**  
**38 Eureka Street, Markham**  
**PLAN 2886 PT BLK B**

The applicant was requesting provisional consent to:

- a) sever and convey a parcel of land with an approximate lot area of 1,429 sq. m (0.1429 ha) (Parts 1 and 2); and
- b) retain a parcel of land with an approximate lot area of 1,477 sq. m (0.1477 ha) (Part 3).

The purpose of this application was to sever a portion of the subject property (rear yard) to facilitate the creation of new municipally-owned parkland. The existing dwelling fronting Eureka Street will be retained within a new lot of reduced size. This application was related to a Zoning By-law Amendment (PLAN 22 243326) and Site Plan Control application (SPC 22 116603).

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Mitchell Robins, appeared on behalf of the application and provided a presentation. The application was to sever and convey to the City portions of 36 and 38 Eureka Street for a new park. The retained lots met the required lot frontage and areas. In addition, the retained lots would be in greater alignment with the surrounding lots. The severed portions of the lots would be merged with 34 Eureka Street and had been rezoned to park. The park was public and would be used by the entire community.

Christiane Bergauer-Free, 145 Krieghoff Avenue, was pleased to know there would be additional parkland for the community. However, Christiane was concerned that the size of the park would not be able to meet the needs of the community.

Member Yan asked if the lands to be conveyed would form part of the required parkland dedication for the development, and if the determination of the park's amenities proceed through a public process.

Mitchell Robins indicated the severed lots would be parkland dedication for the development and would be added to the existing Anna Russell Parkette. Mitchell indicated that the park would go through City processes concerning the development of amenities.

Member Prasad recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Arun Prasad**  
**Seconded By: Jeamie Reingold**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/020/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried



**2. B/021/22**

**Owner Name: Kelly Jamieson**  
**Agent Name: Minto Communities Inc. (Anderson Marques)**  
**36 Eureka Street, Markham**  
**PLAN 2886 PT BLK B**

The applicant was requesting provisional consent to:

- a) sever and convey a parcel of land with an approximate lot area of 1,430 sq. m (0.1430 ha) (Part 1); and
- b) retain a parcel of land with an approximate lot area of 1,482 sq. m (0.1482 ha) (Part 2).

The purpose of this application was to sever a portion of the subject property (rear yard) to facilitate the creation of new municipally-owned parkland. The existing dwelling fronting Eureka Street will be retained within a new lot of reduced size. This application was related to a Zoning By-law Amendment (PLAN 22 243326) and Site Plan Control application (SPC 22 116603).

This application was heard concurrently with B/020/22.

**Moved By: Arun Prasad**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/021/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**3. A/160/22**

**Owner Name: Mukul and Nandita Kshirasagar**  
**Agent Name: Lifestyle Home Products (Andrijana Adamovic)**  
**111 Hertford Crescent, Markham**  
**PLAN 65M2951 PT LOT 59 RS65R16964 PART 91**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 90-81, as amended, to permit:

**a) Section 6.2.2:**

a minimum rear yard setback of 5.64 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 7.50 metres;

as it related to a proposed rear sunroom addition.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Syed Amut, appeared on behalf of the application and indicated they agreed with the staff report.

Member Yan noted that the proposed one-storey sunroom would have minor impacts on the rear yards of adjacent properties. However, no concerns had been raised by neighbouring residents. Member Yan requested clarification regarding the structure's foundation and how the unit would be heated and cooled.

Syed indicated that the sunroom and a concrete foundation would be attached to the house and heated or cooled by units chosen by the homeowner.

Member Yan indicated that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act* and recommended approval with conditions.

Member Sampson agreed with Member Yan and supported the application.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/160/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**4. A/043/22**

**Owner Name: Red Banner Developments Ltd (Keith Lahey)**  
**Agent Name: ARK Group (Daniel Wong)**  
**5990 16th Avenue, Markham**  
**PLAN 65M3551 LOT 65**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1229, as amended, to permit:

**a) Section 12.24.4:**

a combined maximum gross floor area of 19.90 percent for all types of restaurants at 5970 and 5990 16th Avenue, whereas the By-law permits a combined maximum gross floor area of 15.0 percent for all types of restaurants at 5970 and 5990 16th Avenue;

as it related to a proposed restaurant use.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Ken Tai, appeared on behalf of the application.

Mohammad Baritz, a tenant in the plaza, had taken over a business that had been an existing restaurant for 30 years. Unfortunately, they had been unable to open their business as they had been waiting on a building permit for over a year. He shared information regarding the percentage of GFA used by each restaurant use. In addition, they wanted to understand how the minor variance application would impact their building permit.

Ken Tai had submitted the minor variance application for Sun Tea. The application for 19.9 percent GFA included Sun Tea and all other legally conforming restaurant uses in the plaza. Ken indicated that an operating restaurant that was non-compliant in the plaza was not part of the percentage requested in the application. The parking study showed all existing proposed restaurants and demonstrated sufficient parking for a GFA of 22 percent. Ken indicated that his client was not responsible for applying for the required increase in GFA for the non-compliant unit.

Elizabeth Brown, 65 Lincoln Green Drive, the Committee of Adjustment representative for the Markham Village Sherwood Conservation Residents Association, raised concerns of Councillor Rea, who was attending the Heritage Markham meeting that ran concurrently with the Committee of Adjustment meeting. Concerns had been expressed that the proposed GFA request would only meet the needs of some of the operating and proposed businesses in the plaza. Elizabeth suggested that a deferral might be appropriate to allow for the resolution of the concerns.

Ken Tai presented the GFA required for the proposed Tea Room and non-operational/vacant restaurant and the parking justification study conducted for their client. Ken indicated that the study justified the 22 percent, and the Committee could approve the GFA based on the parking study. The application had only been submitted for their needs, as no other tenants had paid for the justification studies or variance application. They had submitted for a GFA required for the Tea Room.

The Acting Chair asked Greg Whitfield to respond to the comments.

Greg Whitfield noted that the Committee could not approve a variance for 22 percent GFA since the public notice would not meet the requirements of the *Planning Act*. Greg

clarified that the issue arose as the variance would be for the property as a whole. The increased GFA could not be assigned to specific units. The Building Department would determine the permits that could be issued. At 19.9 percent GFA, only two of the three units, the Tea Room, the vacant unit and the non-compliant unit, would be permitted. Approval of 19.9 percent GFA could leave the applicant, or the other party at the meeting outside the GFA allocated for restaurant uses. Greg indicated that a Zoning Preliminary Review had identified 22 percent as the required GFA for all operating and proposed restaurant uses in the plaza. However, staff cannot require the applicant to apply for other businesses which may require the additional GFA and the applicant, at their discretion, had applied for the 19.9 percent. Greg advised that the Committee could defer the application to allow the tenants to work with the property owner and Councillor to bring forward a proposal to resolve the concerns or proceed with the application before them.

Liz Brown also noted a request by the Councillor for a condition requiring that all proposed businesses obtain heritage permits for their signs.

Member Sampson asked if the staff knew the issues when preparing the report.

Greg Whitfield stated that planning doesn't review building permits submitted for a property. Mohammed Baritz had received a zoning review as part of their Building Permit application. He was advised at that time that a minor variance was required. Greg reiterated that staff had advised the applicant of the overall GFA required for all restaurant uses on the property. The agent applied at their discretion for the number they sought.

Ken Tai indicated that they had followed the prescribed process and that other tenants had not taken the initiative nor paid for the application or studies.

Member Sampson was concerned that the process had not served the needs of Mohammed Baritz.

Mohammed Baritz indicated that their lawyer had proceeded to apply for a minor variance and had been advised that unit 222 had already made an application and was for the entire property. Therefore, they did not submit a duplicate application. Mohammed indicated they had been in touch with the tenant of 222 and said they would assist with the application costs to ensure that it was done right for both units.

Member Yan suggested deferring the application to ensure all parties' needs would be addressed. Coordination between the landlord and tenants would ensure that all business needs were met and suggested that the Councillor could assist the parties to resolve the outstanding issues.

The Acting Chair agreed that deferral was necessary to ensure that no parties were left out of the process and that a subsequent application would not be required. However,

additional information was required for the Committee for a fair adjudication of the application.

Member Prasad agreed with their colleagues that a deferral allowed for an opportunity for all parties requiring the additional GFA for restaurant uses to come together with the landlord and resolve the issues.

Member Yan motioned for deferral. The Chair confirmed with the applicant they understood the Committee position.

**Moved By: Sally Yan**  
**Seconded By: Arun Prasad**

The Committee unanimously deferred the application.

THAT Application No. **A/043/22** be **deferred** sine die.

Resolution Carried

**5. A/163/22**

**Owner Name: Vince Wong and Fiona Choy**  
**Agent Name: Vince Wong**  
**14 Wales Avenue, Markham**  
**PLAN 1318 LOT 20**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1229, as amended, to permit:

- a) **Amending By-law 99-90, Section 1.2 (vi):**  
a maximum floor area ratio of ~~53.70~~ **50.0 percent**, whereas the By-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 45.0 percent; **Amended**

as it related to proposed two-storey single detached dwelling.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Vince Wong, appeared on behalf of the application. Vince presented renderings of the home and indicated that the proposed two-storey home complied with all setback, height and lot coverage requirements. The proposed rooms were of standard size with an open-concept kitchen and family room. In addition, there were open-to-below spaces in the foyer and great room for visual interest.

Elizabeth Brown, 65 Lincoln Green Drive, the Committee of Adjustment representative for the Markham Village Sherwood Conservation Residents Association, appeared to speak to the application. Elizabeth expressed concerns regarding the massing and

scale of the proposal, the open-to-below areas, the three-car garage, and the width of the gable. Elizabeth indicated that the proposed building filled the entire building envelope width, depth and height.

Param Anand, 11 Wales Avenue, supported the application and indicated that there are several derelict properties in the area and looked forward to the renewal of the property. Kent Sorensen, 18 Wales Avenue, indicated the proposed dwelling was not in character with the surrounding area and was much larger than other homes on the street. His concerns were not design related but that the proposed size was unnecessary.

Vince Wong indicated that homes on Peter Street and Deer Park Avenue had been granted Floor Area Ratios of greater than 50%. Vince also indicated that they would be willing to make adjustments at the meeting and requested the direction of the Committee.

Member Reingold thanked the applicant for their presentation, noting that the home was of a neutral design that could easily fit within the context of the neighbourhood. The member indicated that, unlike Peter Street, the area did not have significant infill. The member appreciated the idea of coming to a resolution of what the Committee could approve, expressing that it would allow the applicants to obtain permits. Member Reingold indicated that they could support the application at 50 percent.

Member Sampson asked about the removal of the existing garage. Vince indicated that the demolition permit would include the garage.

Member Sampson expressed that the open-to-above areas in the foyer and the great room contributed to the build's overall massing. They would not support the plans as presented and indicated that the variance needed to be reduced to under 50 percent.

Member Yan agreed that a reduction of the FAR to 50 percent was required for approval.

The acting Chair indicated to the applicant that the Committee had expressed that approval could be sought for a variance request of 50 percent.

The owner expressed that they wished to move forward with an application for 50 percent and would look to reduce the dwelling at the rear to reach the required Floor Area Ratio.

Member Sampson indicated that in the interest of moving the application forward, they would agree with the recommendation of the other Committee members for a Floor Area Ratio of 50 percent. Accordingly, Member Sampson motioned for approval of the amended application for a floor area ratio of 50 percent with conditions.

Greg Whitfield stated that any plans submitted would be required to meet the condition of substantial conformity.

**Moved By: Patrick Sampson**  
**Seconded By: Arun Prasad**

The Committee unanimously approved the amended application.

THAT Application No. **A/163/22 as amended** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6. **A/029/22**

**Owner Name: Hua Lu**  
**Agent Name: TAES Architects Inc. (Shenshu Zhang)**  
**28 Hawkridge Avenue, Markham**  
**PLAN 4065 LOT 32**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1229, as amended, to permit:

- a) **Amending By-law 99-90, Section 1.2 (ii):**  
a maximum depth of 17.17 m, whereas the By-law permits a maximum depth of 16.80 m; and
- b) **Amending By-law 99-90, Section 1.2 (vi):**  
a maximum floor area ratio of ~~53.50~~ **50.0 percent**, whereas the By-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 45.0 percent; **Amended**

as it related to a proposed two-storey detached dwelling.

The Acting Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Shenshu Zhang, appeared on behalf of the application, presented the proposal, and highlighted other properties that had been granted similar variances.

Elizabeth Brown, 65 Lincoln Green Drive, the Committee of Adjustment representative for the Markham Village Sherwood Conservation Residents Association, expressed that the proposal did not meet the policies of the Official Plan. The massing of the proposal was not in character with other area infills. Elizabeth indicated that the application had not met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Member Reingold indicated that the request for a 53.50 percent Floor Area Ratio was too high and needed to be reduced to 50 percent or less.

The Acting Chair stated that the request resulted in a 19 percent increase in permitted floor area. As stated earlier, the Committee typically approved variances of 50 percent or less. The Acting Chair reminded the applicant that the Committee considers each

application on a site-specific basis, and approvals granted by previous committees did not set a precedent. The concerns of the Committee were not related to depth but instead to the FAR.

The agent responded that they had reviewed the context of the neighbourhood and felt 53.50 percent was reasonable. The design was created with a one-storey garage, and provincial policy directed municipalities to provide more living space for the community. However, they would agree if the Committee approved a 50 percent FAR request.

Member Prasad indicated that the applicant had agreed to a reduced variance of 50 percent FAR and recommended approval with conditions.

**Moved By: Arun Prasad**  
**Seconded By: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the amended application.

THAT Application No. **A/029/22 as amended** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**Other Business:**

Adjournment

**Moved by: Patrick Sampson**  
**Seconded by: Arun Prasad**

THAT the virtual meeting of the Committee of Adjustment was adjourned at 9:58 pm, and the next regular meeting would be held on November 23, 2022.

CARRIED

Originals Signed  
November 23, 2022  
Secretary-Treasurer  
Committee of Adjustment

Original Signed  
November 23, 2022  
Acting Chair  
Committee of Adjustment