Committee of Adjustment

Chair: Deborah Young (Chair)
Committee: Gerry Murphy (Vice-Chair)
          Linda van Aalst
          Lynn Whitbeck
          Terry Williams

Agenda

Date: Wednesday, November 27, 2019  Time: 3:00 PM
Location: Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

3. Adoption of Previous Minutes

   3.1 Accept the minutes of the October 24th, 2019 meeting.
       Committee of Adjustment - 23 Oct 2019 - Draft Minutes

4. Business Arising From Previous Minutes

5. Public Meetings

   5.1 Consider Minor Variance Application A11-19
       Applicant: Wharton
       Location: Concession 9E Part Lot 11, known municipally as 137662 Grey Road 12, formerly in the Township of St. Vincent, now in the Municipality of Meaford.
       Staff Report: DEV2019-10
6. Other

6.1 Discussion around Draft Procedural By-law & Staff Report

7. Next Meeting

8. Adjournment
Minutes

A Committee of Adjustment meeting of the Municipality of Meaford was held at 3:00 PM at the Council Chambers on October 23, 2019.

Present: Deborah Young (Chair)
Gerry Murphy (Vice-Chair)
Linda van Aalst
Terry Williams

Lynn Whitbeck

Regrets: None.

Staff: Kara Rogers, GIS Coordinator
Liz Buckton, Manager of Development Services
Keirsten Morris, Planning Technician
Kirsten Harvey, Customer Service Clerk/Development & Environmental Services

1. Call to Order

   The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:03PM.

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

   2.1 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof

      None.

3. Adoption of Previous Minutes

   3.1 Accept the minutes of the September 25, 2019 meeting.

      Moved by: Linda van Aalst Seconded by: Terry Williams
That the Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford accepts the minutes of the September 25, 2019 meeting

Carried

4. Business Arising From Previous Minutes

4.1 Business Arising From Previous Minutes

None.

5. Public Meetings

5.1 Consider Minor Variance Application A09/19

Applicant: Dewdney

Location: Concession Broken Front Part Lot 16, Reference Plan 16R-5583 Part 2, known municipally as 350342 Concession A, in the former Township of Sydenham, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Staff Report: DEV2019-06

The proposed application (A09-2019) requests a variance to facilitate the final approval of the building permit issued for the construction of a new dwelling on the property. The applicant received their building permit to build the dwelling with submission of their proposed grading and drainage plan which showed the dwelling to comply with zoning. After construction and upon review of the applicant’s as-constructed grading and drainage plan submitted, the dwelling was shown to have been constructed, in error, at a setback of 1.7m from the interior side lot line rather than the permitted 2m due to the slight angle of the lot lines. Therefore, the application requests relief from Table 6.2.1 of Zoning By-law 60-2009 which requires a minimum interior side yard setback of 2.0m. Application A09-19 requests that the interior side yard setback be reduced to 1.7m on the south side. This variance will facilitate zoning compliance so that the applicant can receive their final building approval.

The Chair opened the Public Meeting.
The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee of comments received from the Municipality's Development Services (Planning Report DEV2019-06), Municipal Transportation Services; Grey Sauble Conservation Authority; Grey County Planning and Development Services; and, Historic Saugeen Metis.

The Committee discussed the general nature of the application.

Committee Member Terry Williams inquired what option the applicant would have if the Committee refused the application. Manager of Development Services, Liz Buckton indicated that an appeal would be the most likely outcome, but further to that the applicant could always try to obtain the required lands through a lot addition to rectify the problem.

Committee Chair Deborah Young asked Vice Chair Gerry Murphy to proceed with the Chair duties for the remainder of the meeting as she was not feeling well.

Having considered the content of all submissions, the Staff Report and oral submissions, the Committee voted on Minor Variance Application A09-19, and the application was APPROVED, the decision reading as follows:

Moved by: Linda van Aalst Seconded by: Terry Williams
Being that the four tests have been satisfied, the Committee hereby approves a variance to Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended, to provide relief from Table 6.2.1 to:

a. Reduce the required interior side yard setback on the south interior side lot line for the dwelling from 2m to 1.7m.

Conditions: None

Reasons for Decision: The Committee is satisfied that the application meets the four tests of a minor variance, as noted in Development Services Staff Report DEV2019-06.

Carried

5.2 Consider Minor Variance A10/19
Applicant: Goreski
Location: Concession Broken Front Part Lot 26, Reference Plan 16R-1683 Part 2, known municipally as 359722 Bayshore Road, in the former Township of Sydenham, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Staff Report: DEV2019-07

The proposed application (A10-2019) requests a variance to facilitate construction of a new detached garage on the property. The application requests relief from Provision 4.1.1.4 of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which requires a maximum height of 4.5m for accessory structures. Application A10/19 requests that the maximum height applicable to the accessory structure be increased from 4.5m to 6.53m for the proposed garage. This variance will facilitate the construction of a new detached garage on a shoreline parcel with a maximum height of 6.53m.

The Chair opened the Public Meeting.

The Secretary-Treasurer advised the Committee of comments received from the Municipality's Development Services (Planning Report DEV2019-07); Municipal Transportation Services; Municipal Building Services; Grey Sauble Conservation Authority; Grey County Planning and Development Services; and, Historic Saugeen Metis.

The Committee discussed the general nature of the application.

Agent for the application, Jamie Kuhl, spoke to the application and that what they were proposing was in keeping with the character on the lot and not impacting neighbouring properties or views.

Having considered the content of all submissions, the Staff Report and oral submissions, the Committee voted on Minor Variance Application A10-19, and the application was APPROVED, the decision reading as follows:

Moved by: Terry Williams Seconded by: Linda van Aalst

*Being that the four tests have been satisfied, the Committee hereby approves a variance to Zoning By-law*
60-2009, as amended, to provide relief from Section 4.1.1.4 to:
  a. Permit the construction of an accessory building having a height not to exceed 6.53m

Conditions: The structure be constructed not nearer than 300m from the front lot line and substantially in the location identified on the plans accompanying application A10-2019.

Reasons for Decision: The Committee is satisfied that the application meets the four tests of a minor variance, as noted in Development Services Staff Report DEV2019-07.

Carried

6. Other

6.1 Property Standards

The Secretary-Treasurer indicated that By-law Enforcement has inquired about the availability of the Committee for a Property Standards Hearing and Training Session in November.

It was discussed and the Committee would be available Wednesday, November 20th at 1PM for this Training and Hearing if required.

6.2 Resignation of Gerry Murphy

Vice Chair Gerry Murphy announced his resignation due to his upcoming departure from the Municipality.

Vice Chair, Gerry Murphy put forward a motion "to move forward with the previous version of the procedural by-law applicable to the Committee of Adjustment, regarding voting, being that any decisions require a majority vote".

The Committee discussed concerns about the impact on staff, the committee and the public perception of the different interpretations regarding approved and refused motions. The Committee with Staff discussed what was proposed in the 2019 draft procedural by-law update and the reasoning behind the
voting, being that the members should be amending any motions, so that the vote is always towards a motion being approved in order to make a decision. It was agreed that a refused or tie motion should not result in a decision on the application. It was also agreed that any decision made should be made by a majority in favour of the motion. The Committee noted that this would help to protect the applicants, the committee and the municipality. The Committee indicated that the examples of applications where the refused motion made a decision should be included in the staff report accompanying the procedural by-law to council.

Secretary-Treasurer, Kara Rogers, suggested that the draft 2019 by-law could be amended in the section regarding voting in order to reflect the previous by-law, and be circulated to the Committee for approval. It would then be forwarded, with the accompanying staff report, to the Clerk for review prior to the next Committee meeting. The Committee asked that if the Clerk was not in agreement with the proposal that he provide justification of why the procedural by-law cannot be proposed that way prior to the next meeting so that the Committee would have time to consider the justification before meeting to discuss the by-law. It was decided by the entire Committee present, that this process would constitute moving forward in the motion.

The Committee thanked Gerry Murphy for his commitment to the Committee and wished him the best in his future endeavors.

Moved by: Gerry Murphy Seconded by: Linda van Aalst
To move forward with the previous version of the procedural by-law applicable to the Committee of Adjustment, regarding voting, being that any decisions require a majority vote

Carried
The meeting was adjourned at 4:01PM.

______________________________
Chair

______________________________
Secretary-Treasurer
Notice of Public Meeting – Committee of Adjustment

Purpose and Effect: The proposed application (A11-2019) requests a variance to facilitate construction of a new 12 horse barn on the property. The application requests relief from Section 4.23.5 b) of Zoning By-law 60-2009, which requires all new livestock operations to be located in compliance with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) II Formulae set out in the MDS Guidelines published by OMAFRA. The minimum MDS II setback required from the road allowance (front lot line) is 19m, calculated using OMAFRA's Agrisuite software. The proposed horse barn complies with all other MDS setbacks and Zoning By-law requirements. Application A11/19 requests that this MDS II setback to the road allowance (front lot line) be reduced from 19m to 12.2m to allow for the placement/construction of the proposed barn outside of the Environmentally Protected Lands on this agricultural parcel.

Related Applications: None.

Location: Concession 9 E Part Lot 11, known municipally as 137662 Grey Road 12, in the former Township of St. Vincent, now in the Municipality of Meaford.

Meeting Date and Time: Wednesday, November 27th, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: 157859 7th Line, Meaford, Ontario (Council Chambers)

You are entitled to attend the meeting in person or to be represented by an agent to express your views on the merits of this application or you may forward correspondence indicating your views. Please note that if you or your agent do not attend the hearing, the Committee may proceed in your absence, and you are not entitled to any further notice of proceedings except as provided by the Planning Act.

If you wish to be notified of the decision of the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment in respect of the proposed variance, you must make a written request to the Municipality of Meaford Committee of Adjustment.

Additional information and material regarding this application are available at the Municipal Administration Office during regular business hours.
If your property contains 7 or more residential units, please post in a location that is visible to all residents.

Proposal Sketch

How can I contribute my opinion?
Any person or agency may attend the Public Meeting and/or make verbal or written comments regarding the proposal.

How do I submit my comments?
Submit written comments prior to the meeting or sign-up to be notified of a decision by contacting or mailing the Secretary-Treasurer:

Kara Rogers
Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment
21 Trowbridge Street West
Meaford, Ontario N4L 1A1
planning@meaford.ca

Under the authority of the Municipal Act, 2001 and in accordance with Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), all information provided for, or at a Public Meeting, Public Consultation, or other Public Process are considered part of the public record, including resident deputations. This information may be posted on the Municipality’s website, and/or made available to the public upon request.

This document can be made available in other accessible formats as soon as practicable upon request.
Date Wednesday, November 27, 2019

From Rob Armstrong, MCIP, RPP
CAO/Director of Development Services

Subject Minor Variance Application A11-2019 – 137662 Grey Road 12

Report No. DEV2019-10 Roll No. 421048000405700

Recommendation

That Committee of Adjustment of the Municipality of Meaford APPROVE Minor Variance A11-2019 providing relief from Section 4.23.5 b) to permit the construction of a new 12 horse barn to be setback no less than 12.2m to the front lot line subject to the following condition:

1) That the building be constructed generally in-keeping with the siting illustrated on the site plan accompanying the application.

Background

The subject lands are comprised of an approximately 54.8 ha (135 acre) agricultural parcel having frontage on Grey Road 12. The lands fall within the Agricultural and Environmental Protection Designations of the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan and within the Agricultural and Environmental Protection zones of Meaford’s Comprehensive Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended. Surrounding land uses include farm sized agricultural and rural lots.

Application A11/19 requests relief from Section 4.23.5 b) of Zoning By-law 60-2009, as amended, to reduce the MDS II setback to the road allowance (front lot line) from 19m to 12.2m to allow for the placement/construction of a new horse barn outside of the Environmentally Protected Lands on this agricultural parcel. A Planning Justification Letter completed by a Registered Professional Planner has been submitted with the application and attached as Appendix 1.
Analysis

An application for a variance to the Zoning By-law must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, County and Local Official Plans and must satisfy Section 45(1) of the Planning Act.

Section 45(1) of the Planning Act authorizes the granting of a minor variance “in respect of the land, building or structure or use thereof”. For a successful variance, the following tests of Section 45(1) of the Planning Act must all be satisfied:

- The variance must be minor;
- The variance must be desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure;
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan; and,
- The variance must maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement – Consistency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The PPS supports agricultural land uses within prime agricultural areas including livestock facilities. It identifies that new or expanding livestock facilities shall comply with the minimum distance separation (MDS) formulae and guidelines developed by the Province to separate uses so as to reduce incompatibility concerns about odour from livestock facilities. The MDS Guidelines developed by the Province indicates that MDS II setbacks can be reduced for a new livestock facility in limited site specific circumstances that meet the intent of the Document. Examples include circumstances that mitigate environmental or public health and safety impacts, or avoid natural or human-made hazards. The document also identifies that the MDS II setback can be reduced through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a minor variance to the zoning by-law provisions.

The intent of the MDS II setback is to minimize nuisance complaints associated with livestock facilities due to odour, thereby reduce potential land use conflicts. The proposed barn meets and exceeds all other MDS II required setbacks from nearby dwellings and lot lines (by approximately 143m as illustrated in the Planning Report attached as Appendix 1). The application proposes to reduce the setback required to the road allowance by 6.8m. Staff understand that due to the low density of the barn (12 horses), it is unlikely that an odour complaint would arise from the road allowance as anyone travelling along the road would be moving and would only be affected for a short amount of time. Staff would consider this reduction to the setback to be minor in nature.

Environmental impacts and natural hazards are types of setback reductions that can be considered to the MDS II requirements. In this case, the property is highly constrained by Environmental Protected (EP) and GSCA regulated lands due to the Big Head River located on the north portion of the property and two tributaries running north and south along the property from the river. To meet the required MDS II setback from the road allowance (or front lot line in this case) of 19m, the barn would need to be constructed behind the two tributaries, outside of the EP zoning. This would require a bridge to be constructed which is not feasible and increases flood risk. Staff are of the opinion that the reduction to the required MDS II setback to the road allowance will maintain the intent of the MDS Document as noted in the Planning Report accompanying the application and are satisfied that the proposed variance is generally consistent
The variance is desirable for appropriate development of the lands. | Yes | The proposed minor variance is intended to facilitate the construction of a livestock facility on a property designated for agricultural use.

Agricultural uses, including livestock facilities, are permitted within the Agricultural zone. Aside from the MDS II setback to the road allowance, the barn is otherwise in-keeping within the standards of the Zoning By-law and MDS II requirements. Staff are of the opinion that the variance would facilitate desirable and appropriate use of the lands.

As noted in the Planning Justification Report a large portion of the lands are zoned Environmental Protection which limits the buildable area on the lot. It is Staff’s opinion that this variance is necessary for the appropriate development of the lands based on the EP constraints. The Zoning Schedule (Map 56, Schedule A) showing the extent of the EP zoned lands is attached as **Appendix 2**.

The variance is ‘minor’. | Yes | The subject lands are zoned Agricultural (A) and Environmental Protection (EP). The land currently contains a dwelling and existing barn in poor condition.

The proposed barn meets all applicable setbacks, but the applicant requests a reduction of the MDS II required setback from 19m to 12.2m (a difference of 6.8m) from the road allowance/front lot line to allow the barn to be sited outside of the EP zoned land.

The proposed barn will be generally sited at a similar distance from the front lot line as the main dwelling and will be clustered near...
the dwelling. The variance is not anticipated to have any impact on the visual character of the area.

Furthermore, because the proposed barn meets all other MDS II setbacks from nearby dwellings, Staff are not concerned with the impact on nearby neighbours.

Staff are of the opinion that the variance is minor in nature and potential impact.

| The variance maintains the general intent & purpose of Official Plan. | Yes | The lands are designated Agricultural and Hazard Lands by the County Official Plan, and Agricultural and Environmental Protection by the Meaford Official Plan. The local Official Plan provides more detailed direction regarding land use.

The Agricultural designation is intended for Agricultural uses which includes livestock facilities. Specific considerations applicable to the siting of livestock structures are not addressed within the Official Plan policies – this is a function of the implementing Zoning By-law.

The proposal would facilitate the construction of an agricultural building on lands set out for agricultural use by the Official Plan.

Staff are of the opinion that the intent of the Official Plan is maintained.

| The variance maintains the general intent & purpose of the Zoning By-law. | Yes | The proposed livestock barn meets all other required setbacks and standards of the zoning by-law other than Section 4.23.5 b) which requires new livestock facilities to be located in compliance with the Province’s MDS II formulae. The barn meets and exceeds all required MDS II setbacks from nearby dwellings other than the required setback to the road allowance/front lot line. |
Staff have discussed the intent of the MDS II requirement to the road allowance previously in this report and would highlight that the manure pile will be located the full 19m from the road allowance.

Staff understand that the applicant has had in depth discussion with the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority regarding the siting of the barn in relation to their regulated lands and EP zoned lands and they are generally supportive of this location. Subject to positive comments from the GSCA, Staff have no concerns.

Staff are of the opinion that the proposed variance would maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

Implications

Approval of the subject variance will facilitate the construction of a horse barn outside of the Environmentally Protected lands on an agricultural parcel.

Consultation and Communications

Notice has been circulated in the manner prescribed by the Planning Act to the following:

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority
Grey County Planning, Transportation and Clerk’s Department
Ontario Power Generation
The City of Owen Sound
Union Gas
Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
Metis Nation of Ontario
Saugeen Ojibway Nation
Historic Saugeen Metis Nation
Bell Canada
Municipality of Meaford – Transportation, Legislative Services, Meaford & District Fire Chief, Intertownship Fire Department and Development & Environmental Services.
Six (6) property owners within 60 meters of the subject lands were circulated notice of the application.

**Conclusion**

It is the opinion of Planning Staff that the subject application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement; meets the four tests of a minor variance, and generally represents good planning. In this regard, Staff recommends that the Committee of Adjustment approve the requested minor variance application, subject to the conditions outlined herein.

**Supporting Documentation**

Appendix 1 – Planning Justification Letter by Ron Davidson, RPP

Appendix 2 – Map 56, Schedule A of Zoning By-law 60-2009

Respectfully Submitted:

_________________________________
Rob Armstrong, MCIP, RPP  
CAO/Director of Development Services

_________________________________
Prepared By:  
Keirsten Morris, Planning Technician
November 11, 2019

Municipality of Meaford
21 Trowbridge St. West
Meaford, ON
N4L 1A1

Attention: Keirsten Morris
Planning Technician

Dear Ms. Morris:

Re: Application for Minor Variance
Part Lot 11, Concession 9, Geographic Township of St. Vincent
Municipality of Meaford
Owner: Kendra Wharton

Further to our previous discussions regarding the above-noted property, enclosed please find a completed Minor Variance application. Also attached are the cheques covering the application fee and the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) review fee.

To assist your office in evaluating this application, I am providing the following information:

**Purpose of Application:**

Kendra Wharton recently purchased the subject 54.8 hectare property on which a house and barn exist. The barn is in poor condition and cannot safely accommodate Ms. Wharton's horses. As such, she is hoping to construct a new barn. Given the amount of natural environment land on the site, Ms. Wharton has no choice but to locate the new barn toward the front of the property, as illustrated on the attached drawing. Whereas the site for the new building would comply with the minimum front yard requirement of the 'A1' zone and also meet the setback requirement pertaining to the
centerline of the County Road, the new barn would not comply with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) formulae as it pertains to setbacks from road allowances. The MDS formulae has been built into the Zoning By-law (Section 4.23.5). This setback requirement is 19 metres (as illustrated in the attached MDS Report), whereas the proposed barn will provide a front yard of only 12.2 metres. A Minor Variance Application is being submitted to address this deficiency.

**Subject Property:**

The subject lands are located along the west side of County Road 12, in the former Township of St. Vincent. The property comprises 54.8 hectares of land. The Big Head River and two tributaries meander through the property. The existing dwelling and barn are situated near the northeast corner of the lot.

**Adjacent Land Uses:**

Most of the lands in this general area are used for agricultural purposes. The Big Head River and its tributaries also have a presence on the neighbouring lands.

**The Planning Act Test for a Minor Variance:**

Section 45 of The Planning Act gives the Committee of Adjustment the authority to grant relief from a provision(s) of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law provided such relief passes four tests:

1. Does the Minor Variance maintain the intent and purpose of the Official Plan?

**Comment:** The subject property is designated ‘Agricultural’ and ‘Environmental Protection’ in the Municipality of Meaford Official Plan. The specific site of the new barn is within the ‘Agricultural’ designation. Permitted uses include agricultural buildings, such as barns. Section D6 of the Official Plan states that new or expanding livestock facilities shall comply with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) formulae. In this regard, the proposed site of the new barn does meet the setback requirement for new barns from sensitive land uses on adjacent properties (e.g. house) as illustrated in the MDS Report attached to this letter; however, the new barn does not meet the MDS setback from the road allowance, which in this instance is 19 metres. The Provincial Government’s MDS Document does give consideration to minor reductions to a required MDS setback in certain instances, as explained later in this Planning Merit Letter. Given that the Official Plan is not intended to be more restrictive than the MDS Document, there is no doubt that a variance to reduce the MDS requirement in a limited manner would maintain the intent and purpose of the Official Plan.
2. Does the Minor Variance maintain the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law?

Comment: Section 4.23.5 b) of the Meaford Zoning By-law requires new or expanding barns to be located in compliance with the MDS formulae. Whereas there is no issue with regard to the separation distance between the new barn and adjacent land uses, the barn doesn’t comply with the MDS’s front yard requirement which, in the case of a barn designed to accommodate 12 medium-framed horses, is 19 metres. The reason for requiring a setback from the road is to limit the odour that may be encountered for anyone driving/walking/biking along the public road. In this particular case, the barn will be set back 12.2 metres from the road allowance, which is 7.8 metres shy of the MDS requirement. Given the very low-density nature of this barn (i.e. 12 horses), it is highly unlikely that an odour conflict would arise, especially given that anyone travelling by the property on the road would keep moving and would not be exposed to any odour for more than a few seconds. It should also be noted that the manure pile can be located the full 19 metres back from the road allowance, which is also a requirement of the MDS Document. In this regard, the proposed variance should be in keeping with the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

It’s very important to the review of this application to understand that, despite requiring relief from the MDS “front yard” requirement, the barn does in fact comply with the 7.5 metre front yard requirement of the ‘A’ (Agricultural) zone for barns under 11 metres in height. The barn also meets the 22.86 metre requirement for building setbacks from the centerline of a County Road.

3. Is the Minor Variance minor in nature?

Comment: This question is generally re-phrased as “what impact will the variance have on the adjacent lands?” On that note, the neighbours should not be impacted. It’s very important to understand that the required separation distance between the new barn and the neighbouring houses is 97 metres (as illustrated in the attached MDS Report) and the site of the new barn will actually be set back 240 metres from the closest neighbour’s house. In this regard, reducing the front yard requirement of the MDS formulae should not impact the neighbours.

4 Would the Minor Variance represent an appropriate or desirable use of the land and buildings?

Comment: The northeast section of the subject property where the existing buildings are located and where the new barn would be erected is situated very close to the ‘Environmental Protection’ (EP) zone. As such, there is no
opportunity to locate the new barn further back from the road, unless a bridge was erected, and that simply is not feasible. Mr. Wharton has worked closely with the GSCA in locating a mutually-acceptable building envelope for the barn, resulting in this precise site being chosen. These particular lands are within the GSCA’s Regulated Area, but are not situated with the ‘EP’ zoned area. Given these limitations and the fact that a slightly-reduced setback from the road should create no negative impacts, the proposed variance would result in a desirable and appropriate use of the subject lands.

**Provincial Policy Statement Conformity:**

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) promotes agricultural land uses in the prime agricultural areas of the Municipality. The PPS would not interfere with a minor reduction to an MDS setback involving front yards.

**Concluding Comments:**

The proposed Minor Variance passes the four tests listed in the Planning Act and is consistent with the PPS. The application should be approved.

I trust you will deem this application package to be complete. Should you require anything further, please contact the undersigned.

Lastly, please contact me with the possible public meeting date before actually scheduling the meeting in order to ensure my availability.

Sincerely,

Ron Davidson, BES, RPP, MCIP

c.c. Kendra Wharton
137662 Grey Road 12
Proposed Minor Variance
Meaford, Ontario
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Proposed Minor Variance
137662 Grey Road 12
Meaford, Ontario
Minimum Distance Separation II
Worksheet 1
Prepared By: Ron Davidson, Planner

Description: Kenrda Wharton
Application Date: Thursday, November 7, 2019
Municipal File Number:

Applicant Contact Information: Not Specified
Location of Subject Livestock Facilities:
County of Grey, Municipality of Meaford
ST. VincenT, Concession: 9, Lot: 11
Roll Number: 42104800405900

Calculation Name: Farm 1
Description: New Barn

The barn area is an estimate only and is intended to provide users with an indication of whether the number of livestock entered is reasonable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manure Type</th>
<th>Type of Livestock/Manure</th>
<th>Existing Maximum Number</th>
<th>Existing Maximum Number (NU)</th>
<th>Total Maximum Number</th>
<th>Total Maximum Number (NU)</th>
<th>Estimated Livestock Barn Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>Horses, Medium-framed, mature; 227 - 680 kg (including unweaned offspring)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>279 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manure Storage: V3. Solid, outside, no cover, >= 30% DM
Existing design capacity (NU): 0.0
Design capacity after alteration (NU): 12.0

Factor A X Factor B X Factor C X Factor D = Building Base Distance F
(minimum distance from livestock barn)
0.7 X 173.33 X 1.1400 X 0.7 = 97 m (318 ft)

Storage Base Distance 'S'
(minimum distance from manure storage)
97 m (318 ft)

MDS II Setback Distance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum Livestock Barn Setback Distance</th>
<th>Actual Livestock Barn Setback Distance</th>
<th>Minimum Manure Storage Setback Distance</th>
<th>Actual Manure Storage Setback Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A Land Uses</td>
<td>97 m 318 ft</td>
<td>240 m 787 ft</td>
<td>97 m 318 ft</td>
<td>240 m 787 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B Land Uses</td>
<td>194 m 635 ft</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>194 m 635 ft</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest lot line (side or rear)</td>
<td>10 m 32 ft</td>
<td>122 m 400 ft</td>
<td>10 m 32 ft</td>
<td>122 m 400 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest road allowance</td>
<td>19 m 64 ft</td>
<td>12 m 39 ft</td>
<td>19 m 64 ft</td>
<td>19 m 62 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE TO THE USER:
The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) has developed this software program for distribution and use with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) Formulae as a public service to assist farmers, consultants, and the general public. This version of the software distributed by OMAFRA will be considered to be the official version for purposes of calculating MDS. OMAFRA is not responsible for errors due to inaccurate or incorrect data or information; mistakes in calculation; errors arising out of modification of the software; or errors arising out of incorrect inputting of data. All data and calculations should be verified before acting on them.
From: Rick Carefoot  
Sent: November 18, 2019 8:27 AM  
To: Kara Rogers <krogers@meaford.ca>  
Subject: RE: Notice of Application & Public Meeting - A11-2019  

To Whom it May Concern  
Re Application: (A11-2019)  
This development will not affect the existing septic system, if the new horse barn proposes a washroom a septic system serving the barn will require a septic permit.

From: Kara Rogers  
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2019 9:45 AM  
To: Rick Carefoot <rcarefoot@meaford.ca>  
Cc: Keirsten Morris <kmorris@meaford.ca>  
Subject: Fwd: Notice of Application & Public Meeting - A11-2019  

Please note that this application paid a septic Review comment fee and will be looking for a comment prior to the next meeting.

Kara  
Sent from my iPhone  

Begin forwarded message:  

From: Keirsten Morris <kmorris@meaford.ca>  
Date: November 14, 2019 at 9:40:26 AM EST  
To: Kara Rogers <krogers@meaford.ca>  
Subject: FW: Notice of Application & Public Meeting - A11-2019  

Hey Kara,  
Just FYI – we collected septic and GSCA fees for this application  

Thanks
Your File: A11-2019
Our File: Meaford Municipality

Ms. Morris,

The Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents and have no objection or opposition to the proposed development, land re-designation, zoning, land severance, Official plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this matter.

Regards,

Chris Hachey

Assistant Coordinator, Lands, Resources and Consultation

Historic Saugeen Métis
204 High Street
Southampton, Ontario, N0H 2L0
Telephone: (519) 483-4000
Fax: (519) 483-4002
Email: hsmasstlrcc@bmts.com

This message is intended for the addressees only. It may contain confidential or privileged information. No rights to privilege have been waived. Any copying, retransmittal, taking of action in reliance on, or other use of the information in this communication by persons other than the intended recipients(s) is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please reply to the sender by e-mail and delete or destroy all copies of this message.