

**MINUTES**

**OXFORD COUNTY LAND DIVISION COMMITTEE**

Thursday, June 2, 2011

The Oxford County Land Division Committee met in the Council Chambers, County Administration Building, Woodstock, Ontario, on Thursday, June 2, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. with the following individuals:

Chairperson	-	J. deBruyn
	-	G. Brumby
	-	W. Buchanan
	-	H. Elliott
	-	M. Hacon
	-	J. Palmer
	-	T. Rock
Corporate Manager	-	G. Hough
Secretary-Treasurer	-	L. Taschner

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

**DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Moved by: J. Palmer  
Seconded by: G. Brumby

*"The Minutes of the Meeting of May 5, 2011, be approved as printed and circulated."*

CARRIED.

**BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES:**

J. de Bruyn indicated that he wished to discuss at the July meeting the format to be used when the Committee is discussing amendments to application.

**GENERAL BUSINESS:**

Correspondence was received from Mr. Larry Boyse requesting an amendment to Application #B10-61-8 (Sharon LaPointe) to include a Partial Discharge of Mortgage.

Moved by: J. Palmer  
Seconded by: M. Hacon

*"That Application #B10-61-8 (Sharon LaPointe) be amended to include a Partial Discharge of Mortgage and that the Secretary-Treasurer of the County of Oxford Land Division Committee be authorized to endorse such Partial Discharge of Mortgage."*

CARRIED.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

A letter of concern was received from J. Stephen Barker regarding Application #B11-10-8 (Jim & Cindy Walker).

---

APPLICATIONS FOR CONSENT:

#B11-10-8 – Jim & Cindy Walker (Lot 5, Concession 1 (East Zorra); Lot 1, Plan M-47, City of Woodstock)

Jim Walker was in attendance to present the application. Also in attendance were the following individuals:

Robert Watson  
3 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Wayne Geall  
28 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Pat Bruvelaitis  
1 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2\

Mike Houle  
16 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Ruby Duivesteyn  
22 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

David Taplay  
250 Pittcock Park Road  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Frank Hemmeler  
252 Pittcock Park Road  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Gerald Jones  
615265 13th Line  
R. R. #7  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Hank Roy  
7 Summit Crescent  
Woodstock ON N4S 7W2

Jim Walker indicated that his daughter and son-in-law approached him and his wife indicating that they would like to build a home on the subject property. He pointed out that there are only three lots in the vicinity with larger lot frontages, varying in size from 250 feet to 350 feet. He indicated that the lots to be severed and retained will meet the Zoning Provisions of the Woodstock Zoning By-law and complied with the Official Plan policies. He indicated that the Fire Department had no concerns or objections with the application. He thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak.

The purpose of the Application for Consent is to create a residential building lot. The lot to be severed will cover an area of 2,128 sq. m (22,906.4 sq. ft.) and contains no buildings or structures. The lot to be retained will cover an area of 5,000 sq. m (53,821.3 sq. ft.), and contains an existing single detached dwelling and attached garage. It is proposed that a single detached dwelling will be constructed on the lot to be severed. The owners have also applied for a Partial Discharge of Mortgage.

G. Hough reviewed the staff Planning Report. He explained that the City of Woodstock had recently initiated amendments to the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law to address the Summit Crescent / Havelock Corners area, which were annexed into the City of Woodstock in 2006. The lands to the east, stretching from the 13<sup>th</sup> Line to Oxford Road 4, south of Oxford Road 17, were subject to a Secondary Plan which was approved in 2008. The above-noted amendments initiated by the City are to come before the Councils of the City of Woodstock and the County of Oxford later this summer. The application for severance was submitted in March, 2011 and has been considered by staff on the basis of the current policies in place. Woodstock Council considered the severance on May 19, 2011 and recommended a deferral of the application. He noted that the City of Woodstock controls an easement measuring 25 feet by 80 feet which extends up the easterly side of the subject lands and around the northerly and westerly boundaries. No buildings are permitted to be constructed anywhere within this easement.

Jim Walker stated that he concurred with the findings and suggested conditions of the staff Planning Report. He pointed out that to date he has removed approximately 20 to 30 trees that have died. He has replaced them.

G. Hough pointed out that the subject properties in 2003 were part of the Township of East Zorra-Tavistock and subject to the Township's Zoning By-law. The zoning required a lot area of 2,800 sq. m (30,140 sq. ft) for an unserviced lot. The new By-law, City of Woodstock Zoning By-law 8626-10 also requires a lot area of 2,800 sq. m for unserviced lots. For those lots which are serviced, the property must meet the 'typical' R1 zone provisions, which are considerably smaller. The severance proposal meets the R1 Zone provisions. The existing garage attached to the dwelling on the retained lands will be renovated and the garage doors will be made to face the street and therefore, no easement for access purposes will be necessary.

Jim Walker confirmed that the garage will be renovated so that the garage doors will face the street.

Robert Watson read from his prepared letter of objection. He suggested that the property is located within a Rural Cluster. He passed around photos of Summit Crescent and pointed out that the homes are well spaced out and suggested that Summit Crescent was designed, planned and maintained to be a street of 'Rural Residential' homes. The lots have one acre or more of area with 250' or greater lot frontages. He suggested that the new home to be constructed on the severed lot will only have a maximum lot width of 49 feet and if it is to meet the setbacks on Summit Crescent, it would be built 19 feet from the Walker's existing home. He stated that it will not conform to the County policies on spacing when introducing a new residential lot. He further noted that if the new house was to be built 25 feet wide to maximize the spacing between houses, the house will not conform with the existing policies which speak to the characteristics of the existing street development. He indicated that Woodstock Council deferred the application until such time as the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law are completed.

Mike Houle indicated that he is the newest resident in the area. He stated that he likes the country setting with City amenities. He stated that the area has a unique setting which was established by planners 30 years ago. He pointed out that he was not aware of the R1 Zoning on the property and suggested that it changed without public consultation. He concurs with Woodstock Council's recommendation to defer the application. He noted that infilling will alter the character of Summit Crescent, and will result in a precedent being set.

Mrs. Pat Bruvelaitis read from a prepared letter of objection. She indicated that she and her husband have lived on this street for 30 years. She indicated she had no bad feelings toward the Walkers but feels that important considerations have been ignored in determining the recommendation. Decisions on the ongoing Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law change should be made prior to severances being permitted in the area. She also indicated that there are ten properties with lot areas over 1 acre in size and that the area has a unique character of widely spaced properties. Approval of the severance will open the door to a very different neighbourhood. She stated that approval of the application would be insensitive to the continuity of the streetscape.

Mrs. Dorothy Geall read from her prepared letter of concern. She pointed out that she and her husband built their home on Summit Crescent in 1988 conforming to the existing character and county uniqueness of the area. They live directly across the road from the subject property. She stated that all of the nine homes on the street have 250 to 350 feet of frontage. Their property has 300 feet plus. She felt that the severance of a lot with only 47.5 feet lot frontage may cause a reduction in the value of the other properties on Summit Crescent. She questioned how the severance can be considered when the Official Plan and the Zoning Change is yet to be dealt with. She further pointed out that there are drainage issues in the area already, and does not want to have more.

David Taplay pointed out that he owns the middle lot on the 13th Line, immediately east of the severed lot. He stated that his only source of drainage is through the 25 foot easement. If a house is constructed on the severed lot, it will affect the grading and the easement. The easement must remain as is to enable the other properties to drain into it.

Frank Hemmelder indicated he owns the property at the corner of Pittock Park Road and Summit Crescent. His backyard backs onto the Walker property. The new house will be at the edge of his backyard. His backyard drains into the easement. He stated his privacy will be impeded and he does not want issues with drainage from his property.

Jim Walker thanked the neighbours for their input. He indicated that he had looked into building a storage building on the property. He felt that the 25 foot ditch (easement) is necessary as there are underground pipes. He appreciates the concerns of the neighbours.

Frank Hemmelder responded to Mr. Walker's comments. He stated that a storage building at the edge of his property would be very different from a house.

David Taplay pointed out that the area of the easement is lower than the road. The residents have no choice but to require the area for the drainage.

Mr. Wayne Geall stated he and his wife live directly across the road from the Walkers. He suggested that the Walkers moved into the area because of its uniqueness. He asked Mr. Walker whether he felt that the characteristics of the neighbourhood would change with the severance. In response, Mr. Walker suggested that the severance will not affect the privacy of the other residents.

T. Rock asked the Corporate Manager how the zoning changes are introduced. In response, G. Hough pointed out that with respect to the 2010 changes, written notification was made to the area residents where significant changes were proposed. G. Hough indicated Havelock Corner's residents were not directly notified, however, there were several newspaper notifications published regarding the new zoning by-law. Regarding the proposed amendments initiated by the City, consultation with the neighbours has been taking place for some time.

G. Hough reviewed the R1 Zone Provisions. He noted that the lot sizes required in the R1 Zone are smaller for a serviced lot and the side yard setbacks are 3.0 m on one side and 1.5 m on the other. It was noted that these setbacks are no different than those found in the RR Zone that applied to the lands prior to the adoption of the City's Zoning By-law in 2010.

T. Rock questioned how the severance is considered to be in keeping with the area? In response, G. Hough stated that current policies refer to development in the 'vicinity' and it was his opinion that the term vicinity does not only include Summit Crescent.

H. Elliott noted that the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law change are yet to be dealt with and questioned whether the Committee is in error of proceeding with the severance? He further pointed out that the City of Woodstock is undertaking a review of the area, and that the severance application has been made under the present policies. G. Hough explained that the proposal is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and meets the intent of the current Official Plan policies. H. Elliott stated that he sympathizes with the residents.

G. Brumby questioned that the Committee was only dealing with the severance application? G. Hough responded in the affirmative.

W. Buchanan stated that the City of Woodstock gave no direction and simply requested a deferral of the application. He asked whether the Land Division Committee could make a decision on the application.

G. Hough pointed out that there will be an Open House held on June 21st with the neighbourhood. He stated that the applicants are protected under the present policies of the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law, even if Woodstock changes the designation and zoning of the area.

M. Hacon noted that it is the responsibility of the Building Department to ensure that the house meets the intent and character of the area. In response, G. Hough indicated that the Building Department would be responsible for ensuring that any house meets the requirements of the zoning by-law. He confirmed that the lots meet the By-law requirements today.

W. Buchanan indicated that the lot could be re-zoned to a special R1 Zone, recognizing the 2,800 sq. m lot area for an unserviced lot, with a 50-foot frontage.

G. Brumby suggested that it is the Committee's responsibility to make decisions based on the application as it is submitted.

T. Rock agreed with G. Brumby.

J. de Bruyn suggested there was a lot grading issue. He questioned whether this would be dealt with in the Severance Agreement? In response, G. Hough stated that the City is aware of the drain in the area and suggested it will be protected.

T. Rock questioned whether a clearance will be needed from the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority? In response, G. Hough indicated that if the property is located within the Conservation Authority's regulated area their comments will need to be addressed.

Robert Watson passed around photos of homes along the 13th Line. He suggested that there are no lots along the 13th Line or along Summit Crescent with 70 foot lot frontages. He referred to a letter dated November 18, 2010, and indicated that the new development along the 13th Line are for townhouses with frontages on the road. He further questioned again, how a house will fit on frontage of 49 feet. He stated that it is up to the Land Division Committee to protect and make sure established appearance of the area is protected and maintained. Tax payers need to be protected.

Moved by: J. Palmer  
Seconded by: W. Buchanan

*"Not Granted"*

REASON:

1. It was the opinion of the County of Oxford Land Division Committee that the proposed lot is inconsistent with the existing properties on Summit Crescent, Woodstock and, therefore, does not comply with the relevant policies of the County of Oxford Official Plan.

CARRIED.

---

#B11-13-8 – Starbank Development 1678 Corporation (Part Lot 18, Concession 2, formerly East Oxford, City of Woodstock)

Caroline Baker, of GSP Group, was in attendance to present the application. She explained that there is currently commercial development underway on the subject property. The lot to be severed is currently zoned M1 and M2.

The purpose of the Application for Consent is to create a vacant industrial lot. The lot to be severed will cover an area of 1.93 ha (4.76 ac) and contains no buildings or structures. The lot to be retained will cover an area of 3.78 ha (9.33 ac) and is also vacant. It is proposed that the severed lot will continue to be used for future industrial uses, while the lot to be retained will be used for commercial development. An easement is proposed over the lot to be severed in favour of the lot to be retained for access purposes. The owner has also applied for a Partial Discharge of Mortgage.

G. Hough briefly reviewed the staff Planning Report. He pointed out that the Hercules Tire business was previously situated on this lot. The building has since been torn down. There is a split zoning on the property. It does not affect the development of the property. The application is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement, complies with the County of Oxford Official Plan and the subject property is appropriately zoned.

J. Palmer pointed out the difference in the elevation between the severed and retained lots and questioned whether this caused any concerns. In response, C. Baker pointed out that the properties will be subject to site plan and grading plans prior to development.

G. Brumby also noted the change in grading to be approximately 10 feet. In response, C. Baker indicated that there are no current plans for the severed lot.

W. Buchanan questioned the driveway access easement. In response, C. Baker indicated that both properties will have full access and that the easement access has been designed to accommodate transport trucks.

J. de Bruyn asked whether the property owner to the west would be benefiting from the easement. In response, C. Baker indicated no.

Moved by: J. Palmer  
Seconded by: M. Hacon

*'Granted'*

CONDITIONS:

1. The owner shall enter into a Severance Agreement with the City of Woodstock, as set forth in the City of Woodstock By-Law No. 5266-76, and amendments thereto. The agreement will be registered on title by the owner.
2. The owner provides confirmation of the location of any existing overhead or underground services installed to the retained and severed lots. Services cannot traverse the adjoining lots and any conflicts must be re-directed or an easement created. Any proposed easements shall be to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock and the Secretary-Treasurer of the Land Division Committee.
3. The applicant will provide a cross section of the proposed easement showing that the proposed 12.1 metre (39.6 feet) is wide enough to provide proper access into and out of the site, to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock
4. The owner shall agree, in writing, to satisfy all requirements, financial and otherwise, of the City of Woodstock regarding the installation of services and drainage facilities.
5. The owner shall create an easement over the severed parcel in favour of the retained parcel as identified on Plate 3 of Report No. 2011-108, for the purpose of access and servicing, to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock.
6. The owner shall submit a recent survey to confirm size of the severed lot to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock Engineering Office.
7. The owner shall create a hydro servicing easement or easements over the severed and retained lands in favour of and to the satisfaction of Woodstock Hydro Services Inc.
8. The owner shall dedicate a road widening to 13.1 m (43 ft) from the centre line of Parkinson Road, along the frontage of the lot to be severed, to the County of Oxford, free of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of the County Public Works Department.
9. The Clerk of the City of Woodstock advise the Secretary-Treasurer of the Land Division Committee that all requirements of the City of Woodstock have been complied with.
10. All stated conditions must be satisfied pursuant to Subsection 41, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If all conditions are not met within one year, this Application for Consent shall be deemed to be refused. The required instruments must be presented for certification pursuant to Subsection 42, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year from the date of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If the said instruments are not presented and certified within one year, the consent herein shall lapse.

REASONS:

1. The application for consent is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.
2. The application for consent complies with the policies of the County of Oxford Official Plan.

- 
3. The subject property is appropriately zoned.

CARRIED.

---

#B11-11-3 – Jack Lodewyks (Part Lots 2 & 3, Concession 1, formerly East Oxford, Township of Norwich)

Jack & Diana Lodewyks were in attendance to present their application. Also in attendance was Mr. William Clark, R. R. #4, Woodstock ON N4S 7V8. J. Lodewyks briefly explained the application to the Committee.

The purpose of the Application for Consent is to sever a surplus accessory single detached dwelling from a farm property. The lot to be severed will cover an area of 0.42 (1.0 ac) and contains an existing single detached dwelling and a small shed. The lot to be retained will cover an area of 37.1 ha (92.43 ac), contains numerous farm buildings, including two poultry (chicken broiler) barns and an accessory single detached dwelling, and is in agricultural production. The lot to be severed will be used for non-farm rural residential purposes, while the lot to be retained will continue to be used for agricultural purposes. The owner has also applied for Partial Discharge of Mortgage.

G. Hough briefly reviewed the staff Planning Report. He pointed out that the application is similar to the application presented by Mr. Lodewyks in 2006. The 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the County of Oxford Official Plan does not permit such severances, and explained that the only agricultural severance permitted is through a parcel consolidation. He explained that there are two dwellings on the property. The second residence was permitted through a minor variance in 1990; however, not in the location recommended by Planning staff. He explained that the owner met with Planning staff in 2005 and by the time the application was submitted by his planner, policies had changed and the only way a severance would be permitted was through a parcel consolidation. Mr. Lodewyks' application was denied by the Committee in 2006.

J. Palmer questioned whether the rules have changed? G. Hough indicated no. J. Palmer questioned why the application was accepted? In response, G. Hough stated that Planning staff is obligated to accept all applications.

B. Clark pointed out that he received a notice for the application. He noted that the second dwelling should never have been allowed. He stated that he has no problem with allowing the severance, as long as he could have a severance of his lot as well.

Moved by: J. Palmer  
Seconded by: M. Hacon

*'Not Granted'*

REASONS:

1. In accordance with Section 2.3.4 of the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (2005 PPS), non-farm rural residential lot creation is not permitted unless such lot creation is the result of a farm consolidation. This proposal does not involve a farm consolidation and therefore, this rural development proposal is not permitted.
2. The proposal involves the creation of a non-farm rural residential lot not resulting from a farm consolidation. The severance of a lot for non-farm rural residential use in the Agricultural Reserve designation, other than those resulting from a farm consolidation, are not permitted as per the policies of the County Official Plan.
3. The lot to be severed is not appropriately zoned for the intended non-farm rural residential use.

CARRIED.

---

#B11-09-2 – Carmen Velocci (Part Lots 97 & 98, Plan 111 and Part of James Street, in the Village of Innerkip, Township of East Zorra-Tavistock)

Mrs. Carmen Velocci, together with her husband, Carman Velocci, were in attendance to present the application. Mrs. Velocci indicated that she and her husband wish to build a one-storey home for themselves on the severed lot.

The purpose of the Application for Consent is to create a residential building lot. The lot to be severed will cover an area of 983.2 sq. m (10,583.3 sq. ft.) and contains no buildings or structures. A single detached dwelling is proposed to be constructed on the lot to be severed. The lot to be retained will cover an area of 1,268.1 sq. m (13,650.2 sq. ft.), and contains an existing single detached dwelling with an attached garage and a shed.

G. Hough briefly reviewed the staff Planning Report. He explained that the application is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement, complies with the County of Oxford Official Plan, and conforms to the Zoning By-law provisions. The property is well in excess of the lot provisions of the R1 Zone. The severance represents good use of the land for infilling development.

Mrs. C. Velocci noted that they will be required to decommission the existing well. In response, G. Hough indicated that they will have one year to meet the conditions outlined on their decision.

Moved by: T. Rock  
Seconded by: G. Brumby

*'Granted'*

CONDITIONS:

1. The owner enter into a Severance Agreement with the Township of East Zorra-Tavistock.
2. Prior to the completion of the consent, the owner shall confirm through the County of Oxford Public Works Department that both the lot to be severed and the lot to be retained can be connected to the municipal water and sanitary sewer services on Young Street.
3. The County of Oxford Department of Public Works advise the Secretary-Treasurer of the County of Oxford Land Division Committee that all financial requirements of the County of Oxford with respect to provision of water and sewer services to the subject property have been complied with. This condition can be cleared by payment for the required services or entering into a severance agreement with the area municipality which states that no building permit shall be issued until payment is made to the County. In order to clear this condition, a copy of the draft Severance Agreement which addresses the above requirements to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Works Department, must be provided to the Public Works Department.
4. The owner decommission any private sanitary services located on the lot to be severed and/or the lot to be retained, to the satisfaction of the County of Oxford Public Health and Emergency Services Department.
5. Prior to the completion of the consent, the applicant provide a survey, illustrating setback information for the existing dwelling on the lot to be retained to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Township of East Zorra-Tavistock Zoning By-law, to the satisfaction of the Township of East Zorra-Tavistock.
6. The Clerk of the Township of East Zorra-Tavistock advise the Secretary-Treasurer of the Land Division Committee that all requirements of the Town, financial, services, and otherwise, have been complied with.



- 
7. All stated conditions must be satisfied pursuant to Subsection 41, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If all conditions are not met within one year, this Application for Consent shall be deemed to be refused. The required instruments must be presented for certification pursuant to Subsection 42, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year from the date of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If the said instruments are not presented and certified within one year, the consent herein shall lapse.

REASONS:

1. The application for consent is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.
2. The application for consent complies with the policies of the County of Oxford Official Plan.
3. The subject property is appropriately zoned.

CARRIED.

---

B11-14-8; A11-04-8 – McKinnon & Aaron Bus. Part. Inc. (Part of Block 2, Plan M-73, Part 1, Plan 41R-7782, City of Woodstock)

Joe McKinnon was in attendance to present his application. He briefly explained the proposal to the Committee. He indicated he wishes to separate his two businesses into separate entities. The division line will be through the centre of the building.

The purpose of the Application for Consent is to separate an existing industrial building into two lots. Both the lot to be severed and the lot to be retained will each cover an area of 354.8 sq. m (38,124.6 sq. ft.) and each contains approximately one-half of an existing industrial building.

Permission is sought from Section 19.2, Table 19.2, Interior Side Yard, to permit an interior side yard on the east side of the to be severed and the west side of the lot to be retained of 0 m in place of the 3.0 m (9.8 ft) required by the City of Woodstock Zoning By-law No. 8626-10. The requested relief will permit the separating of the existing industrial building into two separately conveyable parcels.

G. Hough reviewed the staff Planning Report. He indicated the application is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement, complies with the Oxford County Official Plan, and conforms to the City's Zoning By-law. He pointed out that an easement is necessary for access purposes, to allow the owners of each of the two lots to use the driveway.

T. Rock questioned whether there was a need for any easements within the building. In response, G. Hough stated no easements were necessary.

J. de Bruyn asked the owner was in the rear of the property. J. McKinnon responded that it was open yard. J. de Bruyn further asked about drainage easements. In response, G. Hough indicated they would be covered n the conditions of the severance.

Moved by: H. Elliott  
Seconded by: M. Hacon

*'Granted'*

#B11-14-8

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to the completion of the consent, the owner shall agree in writing to satisfy all requirements, financial and otherwise, of the City of Woodstock regarding the installation of services and drainage facilities.
2. Prior to the completion of the consent, the owner shall confirm that no underground or overhead services serving the retained lands traverse the severed parcel and visa versa. Where such services exist, the applicant shall relocate the services or obtain private easements to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock.
3. The owner shall submit a recent survey to confirm size of the severed lot to the satisfaction of the City of Woodstock Engineering Office.
4. Prior to the completion of the consent, Consent File B11-14-8 shall be amended by adding easements for drainage and access for the purpose of ensuring that joint access from Seagrave Road, and drainage matters that affect both the severed and retained lands are addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department.
5. Prior to the completion of the consent, and where the internal plumbing within the existing building located on the severed and retained parcels is such that it is not possible or practical to install separate water service, the applicant shall prepare and register a private agreement between the severed and retained parcels regarding water supply and billing of consumption to the satisfaction of the County Public Works Department.
6. Prior to the completion of the consent, the owner shall submit documents prepared by an architect or professional engineer licensed to practice in Ontario which detail the requirements of the Ontario Building Code for all exposed building faces adjacent to any new lot line where the setback between the said lot line and a building is nil and shall agree in writing to undertake any works necessary to bring the exposed building faces into conformity with the Ontario Building Code, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the City Fire Department.
7. The Clerk of the City of Woodstock advise the Secretary-Treasurer of the Land Division Committee that all requirements of the City of Woodstock have been complied with.
8. All stated conditions must be satisfied pursuant to Subsection 41, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If all conditions are not met within one year, this Application for Consent shall be deemed to be refused. The required instruments must be presented for certification pursuant to Subsection 42, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year from the date of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If the said instruments are not presented and certified within one year, the consent herein shall lapse.

REASONS:

1. The application for consent is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.
2. The application for consent complies with the policies of the County of Oxford Official Plan.
3. The subject property is appropriately zoned.

---

#A11-04-8

REASONS:

1. The variance requested is a minor variance from the provisions of the City of Woodstock Zoning By-law No.8626-10.
2. The variance requested is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure.
3. The variance requested is in keeping with the general intent and purpose of the County of Oxford Official Plan.
4. The variance requested is in keeping with the general intent and purpose of the City of Woodstock Zoning By-law No.8626-10.

CARRIED.

---

#B11-04-3 – Nature Farms Inc. & Jeannette Van Ravenswaay (Part Lot 22, Concession 1, Township of Norwich, formerly North Norwich)

Allan Van Ravenswaay, together with Len Girard, the owner's agent, were in attendance. L. Girard stated that he concurred with the findings and the suggested conditions of the staff supplementary Planning report.

The purpose of the application for Consent is for a lot addition. The lot to be severed will cover an area of 32 ha (79.1 ac), contains no buildings or structures and will be added to the agricultural property to the immediate north. The lot to be retained will cover an area of 0.8 ha (2 ac), contains a residential dwelling and two metal clad out buildings, and will be used for non-farm rural residential purposes. The owners have also applied for a Partial Discharge of Mortgage in conjunction with the severance application.

G. Hough reviewed the supplementary Report. He pointed out that the application was before the Committee at its meeting of April 7, 2011, at which time it was deferred to allow the owner to discuss the issue of the accessory structure on the retained lot, with the Township of Norwich. He indicated that the lot has been re-configured to accommodate all the buildings. The application is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and complies with the Oxford County Official Plan.

J. de Bruyn confirmed with Planning staff that no easements were requested regarding the larger shed on the abutting property. G. Hough answered in the affirmative.

Moved by: W. Buchanan  
Seconded by: T. Rock

*"Granted"*

CONDITIONS:

1. The lot to be retained be appropriately re-zoned and that the said zoning include provisions that limit the total gross floor area and height for buildings and structures accessory to a residential use to not more than 190 m<sup>2</sup> (2,045 ft<sup>2</sup>) and 5.5 m (18 ft.), respectively.
2. The parcel intended to be severed be conveyed to the abutting landowner to the immediate north and be consolidated with said owner's existing property. Any additional transactions with regard to the parcel severed must comply with Subsections 3 and 5, of Section 50 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, and be reflected on the certificate.

3. A road widening to 15 m (50 ft) from the centre line of Salford Road and Oxford County Road 13, along the frontage of the lot to be severed and the lot to be retained be dedicated to the County of Oxford, free of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of the County Director of Public Works.
4. The owner shall dedicate land necessary to establish a 15 m (50 ft) daylight sight triangle at the intersection of Oxford Road 46 and Oxford Road 13, free and clear of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of the County Director of Public Works.
5. If required, drainage assessment re-apportionment be undertaken, pursuant to Section 65 of The Drainage Act, R.S.O. 1990, at the applicants' expense, to the satisfaction of the Township of Norwich.
6. The Clerk of the Township of Norwich advise the Secretary-Treasurer of the Land Division Committee that all requirements of the Township, financial, services and otherwise have been complied with.
7. All stated conditions must be satisfied pursuant to Subsection 41, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If all conditions are not met within one year, this Application for Consent shall be deemed to be refused. The required instruments must be presented for certification pursuant to Subsection 42, of Section 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990, as amended, within one year from the date of the mailing of this Notice of Decision. If the said instruments are not presented and certified within one year, the consent herein shall lapse.

REASONS:

1. The application for consent is consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.
2. The application for consent complies with the policies of the County of Oxford Official Plan.

CARRIED.

---

On the motion of H. Elliott, the Committee meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

*"Gordon Brumby"*

---

VICE-CHAIRPERSON