Memorandum to the City of Markham Committee of Adjustment August 19, 2019

File:	A/83/19
Address:	123 Smoothwater Terrace, Markham
Applicant:	Dhanragie Persaud & Dyal Mahadeo
Hearing Date:	Wednesday September 11, 2019

The following comments are provided on behalf of the East Team:

The applicant is requesting relief from the requirements of the Residential Two*222*224*322 (R2*222*224*322) zone of By-law 177-96, as amended, as it relates to an existing deck:

Section 6.2.1 (b) :

a) To permit a maximum deck projection of 5.69 m (18.7 ft), whereas the By-law permits a maximum projection of 3.0 m (9.84 ft);

BACKGROUND

The subject property is located on the east side of Smoothwater Terrace, which is north of 14th Avenue and west of Donald Cousens Parkway within the Box Grove community. The subject property is developed with a two-storey single-detached dwelling. There is an existing uncovered deck within the rear yard which is the subject of this variance application. The remaining portion of the rear yard is a paved basketball court. The property is surrounded by two-storey single detached dwellings to the north, south and west. The site also abuts Benbridge Parkette to the east (rear) which includes heavily treed valley lands adjacent to the rear of the subject property.

The deck subject to this variance application was initially built without a building permit and exceeded the maximum deck projection requirement. The Owner subsequently received approval of minor variance A/96/17 to permit the existing deck, however the dimensions provided at the time were incorrect. Accordingly, the Owner has submitted a second variance application with the correct dimesions to legalize the existing structure.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting a maximum deck projection of 5.69 m (18.7 ft), whereas the By-law permits a maximum projection of 3.0 m (9.84 ft) for decks with a height greater than 1.0 m (3.3 ft). This is an increase of 2.69 m (8.82 ft). The existing deck has a height of approximately 2.59 m (8.5 ft) from the ground and spans almost the entire width of the rear wall of the existing dwelling. As noted, the applicant has submitted a variance application to legalize an existing deck which was approved through a 2017 variance with the incorrect dimensions.

Applicant's Stated Reason(s) for Not Complying with Zoning

According to the information provided by the applicant, the reason for not complying with Zoning is, *"was not aware, left plans to my contractor to submit on my behalf"*.

Zoning Preliminary Review (ZPR) Not Undertaken

The owner has confirmed that a Zoning Preliminary Review (ZPR) has not been conducted. It is the owner's responsibility to ensure that the application has accurately

identified all the variances to the Zoning By-law required for the proposed development. If the variance request in this application contains errors, or if the need for additional variances is identified during the Building Permit review process, further variance application(s) may be required to address the non-compliance.

PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

No written submissions were received as of Monday August 19th, 2019. It is noted that additional information may be received after the writing of the report, and the Secretary-Treasurer will provide information on this at the meeting.

COMMENTS

As noted, this variance relates to an existing deck that was the subject of an approved variance in 2017. There were errors however in the previous variance application and this second application has been submitted to legalize the structure. The existing deck maintains a generous rear yard setback of approximately 15.83 m (51.93 ft). Additionally, the rear yard abuts adjacent valley lands, and staff are of the opinion that there will be no impact to surrounding properties from the existing deck.

CONCLUSION

Planning Staff have reviewed the application with respect to Section 45(1) of The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, and are of the opinion that the variance request meets the four tests of the Planning Act and have no objection. Staff recommend that the Committee consider public input in reaching a decision.

The onus is ultimately on the applicant to demonstrate why they should be granted relief from the requirements of the zoning by-law, and how they satisfy the tests of the Planning Act required for the granting of minor variances.

Please see Appendix "A" for conditions to be attached to any approval of this application.

PREPARED BY:

François Hémon-Morneau, Development Technician

REVIEWED BY:

Stephen Corr, Senior Planner, East District

File Path: Amanda\File\ 19 130899 \Documents\District Team Comments Memo

APPENDIX "A" CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO ANY APPROVAL OF FILE A/83/19

- 1. The variances apply only to the proposed development as long as it remains;
- 2. That the variances apply only to the subject development, in substantial conformity with the plan(s) attached as 'Appendix B' to this Staff Report and received by the City of Markham on August 9th, 2019, and that the Secretary-Treasurer receive written confirmation from the Director of Planning and Urban Design or designate that this condition has been fulfilled to his or her satisfaction;

CONDITIONS PREPARED BY:

François Hémon-Morneau, Development Technician





