



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

**April 17, 2024**  
**7:00 pm**

**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

**Minutes**

The 6<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the Committee of Adjustment for the year 2024 was held at the time and virtual space above with the following people present:

Arrival Time

Gregory Knight Chair	7:00 pm
Tom Gutfreund	7:00 pm
Jeamie Reingold	7:00 pm
Sally Yan	7:00 pm
Patrick Sampson	7:00 pm

Shawna Houser, Secretary-Treasurer  
Greg Whitfield, Supervisor, Committee of Adjustment  
Vrinda Bhardwaj, Development Technician

**Regrets**

Arun Prasad  
Kelvin Kwok

**DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

None

**Minutes: April 3, 2024**

THAT the minutes of Meeting No. 5, of the City of Markham Committee of Adjustment, held April 3, 2024 respectively, be:

- a) Approved on April 17, 2024.

**Moved by: Jeamie Reingold**  
**Seconded by: Sally Yan**

**Carried**

## **PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

### **1. A/010/24**

**Agent Name: Technoarch Inc. (Harpreet Bhons)  
43 Main Street North, Markham  
PLAN 18 BLK D PT LOTS 7 & 8**

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

**a) By-law 1299, Section 7.1(b):**

an indoor cycling training centre, whereas the by-law does not permit this use;

as it related to a proposed indoor cycling training centre.

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Harpreet Bhons, appeared on behalf of the application. Harpreet detailed the parking standards provided by the city staff and spoke about soundproofing measures provided through the building permit.

The Committee received one written piece of correspondence.

Member Reingold indicated they still had concerns about approving the fitness use because of the parking required to accommodate the class sizes of 45 students while considering the existing parking constraints in the area. Additionally, Member Reingold reiterated the concerns of another tenant regarding the possible noise impacts on their business.

Member Gutfreund supported the application and agreed with the staff report, noting that staff had addressed the parking zoning requirements.

Member Yan agreed with the support given by their colleague and expressed that the proposed use was similar to other commercial uses that could occupy the space and felt the parking needs had been assessed to comply with the parking by-law.

The Chair summarized the discussion at the previous meeting and reiterated concerns regarding parking during peak times and particular seasons. They also confirmed the soundproofing measures for the ceiling with Harpreet.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund  
Seconded by: Sally Yan  
Opposed: Jeamie Reingold  
Greg Knight**

The majority of the Committee approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/010/24** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**2. A/156/23**

**Agent Name: LHW Engineering (Lihang Wang)**  
**5 Sherwood Forest Drive, Markham**  
**PLAN 5810 LOT 149**

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

- a) By-law 99-90, Section 1.2 (vi):**  
a maximum floor area ratio of 50.9 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 45 percent;

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

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Tony Yu, appeared on behalf of the application. Tony highlighted the changes made through engagement with the Resident's Association and the councillor.

The Committee received one written piece of correspondence.

Francis LeBlanc, a neighbour, spoke to the Committee. Francis expressed concerns regarding the proposed size of the house, including massing, height, views, privacy, and drainage.

Tony explained that changes had been made to address the Committee's comments at the previous meeting, including reducing the open to below areas, lowering the ceilings to reduce the height, enclosing the carport, and softening the façade by lowering the entrance and providing variations to the elevations. Tony indicated that the owner would be willing to provide plantings at the rear of the property to address privacy concerns raised by the neighbour.

Member Gutfreund expressed that even with the proposed changes, the house still had considerable massing and indicated that the applicant should reduce the floor area ratio to under 50 percent, as requested by the Committee at the earlier meetings.

Member Yan acknowledged that the applicant had made changes that addressed some of the Committee's requests but still felt there was considerable massing and supported the comments of Member Gutfreund.

Member Sampson was sympathetic to the neighbour's concerns and agreed that the floor area ratio should be reduced to below 50 percent.

Member Reingold appreciated the new design and felt it would fit well in the neighbourhood but also agreed with the recommendations of Member Gutfreund to reduce the floor area ratio and provide privacy landscaping.

The Chair recommended that the applicant consider lowering the front porch ceiling elevation further and reducing the floor area ratio.

Member Gutfreund motioned for deferral.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Jeamie Reingold**

THAT Application No. **A/156/23** be **deferred** sine die.

Resolution Carried

**3. A/114/22**

**Agent Name: Contempo Studio (Marin Zabzuni)**  
**67 Babcombe Drive, Thornhill**  
**PLAN M941 LOT 114**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1767, as amended, to permit:

- a) **By-law 1767, Section 9(i):**  
an architectural feature encroachment of 27 inches, whereas the by-law permits an encroachment of no more than 18 inches into the required front yard;
- b) **By-law 1767, Amending By-law 100-90, Section 1.2(i):**  
a maximum building height of 8.59 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum flat roof building height of 8.0 metres; and
- c) **By-law 1767, Amending By-law 100-90, Section 1.2(iii):**  
a building depth of 18.15 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.8 metres;

as it related to the construction of a new two-storey detached dwelling.

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Marin Zabzuni, presented on behalf of the application. The key changes in the proposal included the removal of variances for the front yard setback, lot coverage, floor area ratio, and a reduction in depth.

The Committee received seven written pieces of correspondence.

Anthony Szeto and Rishi Singh, rear yard neighbours, indicated they had met with the applicant to discuss drainage concerns. The applicant indicated they would address the ongoing issues with pooling on the property and hoped they could work collaboratively with City Engineering to address drainage issues impacting their properties.

Sarah Langdon, an adjacent neighbour, indicated the need for proper vegetative screening to address privacy concerns relating to the two-storey windows at the rear of the dwelling.

Member Reingold noted that the Committee encouraged a variety of architectural styles; however, as the design was unlike anything else in the neighbourhood, the proposed house would be tall and imposing on the streetscape.

Member Gutfreund felt the requests were minor. The member noted that the applicant had made changes to the design that addressed previous comments made by the Committee. The owner had indicated they would plant trees to address privacy impacts related to the build. The contemporary design would be a welcome addition to the area and improve the property. In addition, Member Gutfreund expressed that a drainage plan had to be approved by the city's engineer, and runoff and pooling should be addressed during this process.

Member Yan commended the agent for working with residents to resolve some of the issues raised at the previous meeting. Member Yan noted that the impacts they had identified during previous hearings were related to the variances that had been removed, and therefore, their concerns regarding the application had been addressed. Member Yan considered the requests minor and appreciated the contemporary design which would add to the streetscape.

The Chair agreed with their colleagues that the applicant had presented a thoughtful design that had addressed the Committee's comments, noting that the neighbour's concern regarding drainage and privacy could be resolved through other permitting processes.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**

**Seconded by: Sally Yan**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/114/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**4. A/186/23**

**Agent Name: Contempo Studio (Marin Zabzuni)**  
**12 Hammok Crescent, Thornhill**  
**PLAN M941 LOT 156**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 1767, as amended, to permit:

- a) **By-law 1767, Section 14(i)(c):**  
a minimum rear yard setback of 26 feet 6 inches, whereas the by-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 40 feet;
- b) **Parking By-law 28-97, Section 6.2.4.5 (a)(i):**  
a second 3.7 metre wide driveway with a main building setback of 7.63 metres from the public street, whereas the by-law requires the main building to be setback at least 8.0 metres from the street line;
- c) **By-law 1767, Amending By-law 100-90, Section 1.2(i):**  
a maximum flat roof building height of 8.62 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum flat roof building height of 8.0 metres;
- d) **By-law 1767, Section 14(i)(c):**  
a front yard setback of 25 feet, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 30 feet; and
- e) **By-law 1767, Amending By-law 100-90, Section 1.2(iii):**  
a building depth of 17.79 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.8 metres;

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

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Marin Zabzuni, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee received eight written pieces of correspondence.

Tina Luo spoke to the Committee on behalf of four adjacent neighbouring property owners. Tina presented photographic evidence of flooding on the property and runoff from the site to the adjacent properties with lower elevations. The neighbours were

concerned that the proposed increased building size and additional hardscaping would create further flooding issues for the surrounding properties. Additionally, Tina expressed that the large covered porch would bring the outdoor living space very close to the property line and encroach upon the privacy of the rear yard neighbours.

Evelin Ellison, president of the Ward 1 Residents Association, provided some historical context to the development of the subdivision and requested the applicant to implement protocols for bird-friendly builds.

Marin detailed the changes made to the application, to address the Committee's and neighbours' concerns raised at the previous meeting. Marin indicated that the proposal would be subject to a Residential Infill Grading and Servicing application and that it was of equal importance and benefit to the owner to address the ongoing water pooling on the property.

Member Gutfreund noted that the applicant had made changes that addressed concerns raised by the Committee. Member Gutfreund did not feel the rear covered porch would create impacts and considered the application minor, and it met the four tests of the Planning Act. Member Gutfreund expressed that the drainage concerns would be addressed through the grading application process.

Member Reingold had continued concerns regarding the large amount of coverage proposed through the building and the hard landscaping. Member Reingold was not supportive of changes to the driveway.

The Chair expressed to the neighbours that a building permit would only be issued once the grading had been reviewed and that the drainage should be improved by implementing the modern grading practices prescribed by the City.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/186/23** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**5. A/218/23**

**Agent Name: Prohome Consulting Inc (Vincent Emami)**  
**66 Fonthill Boulevard, Markham**  
**PLAN 7566 LOT 133**

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

- a) **By-law 11-72, Section 6.1:**  
a maximum lot coverage of 35.85 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 33.33 percent;
- b) **By-law 11-72, Section 6.1:**  
a maximum building height of 26 feet 6 inches, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building height of 25 feet; and
- c) **By-law 11-72, Section 6.1:**  
a minimum flankage side yard of 10 feet, whereas the by-law requires a minimum flankage side yard of 13 feet 3 inches with half the building height of 26 feet 6 inches;

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

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Francesco Fiorani, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Yan appreciated the changes made by the applicant, which would maintain the existing trees on site. They considered the application minor and that the variances met the four tests of the Planning Act.

Member Reingold expressed that the proposal was a thoughtful solution to infill development that was sensitive to the existing neighbourhood and supported the application.

Member Gutfreund agreed with their colleagues.

Member Yan motioned for approval with conditions.

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

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/218/23** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**NEW BUSINESS:**



Applications B/043/23 and A/214/23 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/043/23.

**1. B/043/23**

**Agent Name: Gregory Design Group (Shane Gregory)  
23 Deer Park Lane, Markham  
CON 8 PT LT 15**

The applicant was requesting provisional consent to:

- a) **sever and convey** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 20.12 metres and an approximate lot area of 398.65 square metres (Part 2); and
- b) **retain** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 11.50 metres and an approximate lot area of 229.19 square metres (Part 1).

The purpose of this application was to sever the Subject Lands to facilitate the creation of one (1) new residential lot.

This application was related to Minor Variance Application A/214/23 which was being reviewed concurrently.

The Chair introduced the application.

The agent, Russ Gregory, appeared on behalf of the application and expressed that, in his opinion, the application did not require an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment and provided information regarding the context of the neighbourhood.

The Committee received two written pieces of correspondence.

Elizabeth Brown, Committee of Adjustment representative for the Markham Village Sherwood Conservation Residents Association spoke to the Committee, noting that staff had recommended the refusal of the application. Elizabeth expressed concerns that the proposed lot would be smaller than other lots within the area and that the house was large for the lot and recommended that the application not be approved.

The Chair requested that the applicant provide planning evidence that the requested lot size was appropriate.

Russ Gregory responded that Markham Council and the Committee of Adjustment had approved similar applications and that requiring the owner to apply for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments would be financially burdensome. Russ expressed that the owner intended to occupy the house and required a design to allow for aging in place. In Russ's opinion, the application would not be precedent-setting, and it met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Member Gutfreund questioned if the bungalow house design was the most appropriate for aging in place.

Russ Gregory responded that while the house could be reduced, the proposed lot was too small to accommodate a traditional bungalow, and the bungalow design allowed for greater financial viability for the proposed house.

Member Reingold liked the application noting the varied housing options available on the surrounding properties and appreciated the bungalow design feeling it would not negatively impact the neighbourhood. Member Reingold asked how assurances could be given that the newly developed home would be maintained in the same ownership and used for aging in place.

Russ Gregory indicated that the ultimate final ownership of the retained and severed homes would be determined according to the family's needs at the end of the project.

The Chair agreed that the area presented a variety of low-density housing options and indicated that while the application was perhaps not the best planning instrument for the property, it provided an eloquent solution that would result in a less intrusive and intensive development.

Member Gutfreund expressed that the area already had a mix of housing, including townhouses and semi-detached and detached homes, and the need for housing within the city boundaries was ongoing. Member Gutfreund could appreciate the desire to reduce fees and costs associated with the project and believed the proposal would be a good addition to the area.

Greg Whitfield read the proposed conditions for the Consent and Minor Variance decisions. Russ Gregory acknowledged and agreed to the conditions.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions, prefacing their motion with comments that the location, circumstance and designs were unique to the application and were considered on their own merits. The approval of this application should not be considered precedent-setting for future Committee of Adjustment applications in this neighbourhood or any other area within the City of Markham.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Jeamie Reingold**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/043/23** be **approved** subject to conditions as read out loud in the meeting.

Resolution Carried

**2. A/214/23**

**Agent Name: Gregory Design Group (Shane Gregory)  
23 Deer Park Lane, Markham  
CON 8 PT LT 15**

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

- a) **By-law 1229, Section Table 11.1:**  
a front yard setback of 9.51 feet, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 25 feet;
- b) **By-law 1229, Section Table 11.1:**  
a rear yard setback of 15.92 feet, whereas the by-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet;
- c) **By-law 1229, Section Table 11.1:**  
a lot area of 4291.14 square feet, whereas the by-law requires a minimum lot area of 6,600 square feet;
- d) **Amending By-law 99-90, Section 1.2(i):**  
a height of 10.06 metres whereas the by-law permits a maximum height of 9.8 metres;
- e) **By-law 1229, Section Table 11.1:**  
a lot coverage of 42.48 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 35 percent;
- f) **By-law 142-95, Section 2.2(a)(i):**  
a deck with a rear yard setback of 1.8 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum of 3 metres for the rear yard setback; and
- g) **Amending By-law 99-90, Section 1.2(vi):**  
a maximum floor area ratio of 63.64 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 45 percent;

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

This application was related to Consent application B/043/23 which was being reviewed concurrently.

Applications B/043/23 and A/214/23 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/043/23.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Sally Yan**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/214/23** be **approved** subject to conditions as read out loud in the meeting.

#### Resolution Carried

Applications B/009/22, B/028/22, A/245/22, A/246/22, and A/247/22 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/009/22.

### 3. **B/009/22**

**Agent Name: In Roads Consultants (Ida Evangelista)**  
**81 Woodward Avenue, Thornhill**  
**PLAN 2446 LOT 190 W PT LOT 189**

The applicant was requesting provisional consent to:

- a) **sever and convey** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 7.62 m (25 ft) and an approximate lot area of 325.16 m<sup>2</sup> (3499.99 ft<sup>2</sup>)(Part 2); and
- b) **retain** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 15.24 m (50 ft) and an approximate lot area of 650.32 m<sup>2</sup> (6999.99 ft<sup>2</sup>)(Part 1).

The purpose of this application was to sever and convey a portion of 81 Woodward Avenue (Part 2) with the intent to merge this parcel with the severed portion of 85 Woodward Avenue (B/028/22)(Part 3) to facilitate the creation of one new residential lot. This application was related to Consent Application B/028/22 and Minor Variance Applications A/245/22, A/246/22 and A/247/22, which are being reviewed concurrently.

The Chair introduced the applications.

The agent, Ida Evangelista, appeared on behalf of the application. Ida outlined the application and the housing stock within the immediate area.

The Committee received five written pieces of correspondence.

Tarun Dewan, president of the Grandview Area Residents Association, indicated that they had no concerns regarding the consent applications as they would provide three lots consistent with lots size and shape within the neighbourhood. Tarun discussed impacts related to the proposed side yard setbacks and increased height and floor area ratio.

Corie Bonnaffon, an adjacent neighbour, did not have issues with the creation of an additional lot and welcomed new residents to the area. As homeowners, they were concerned that the new homes would overwhelm their house. Also, they asked for assurances that neighbours would be consulted regarding changes to the existing retaining wall, drainage and shared fencing before and during construction.

James Fong, a neighbour, indicated they had no concerns with the consent applications; however, they expressed that they and other neighbours considered the proposed houses to be too large, too close to the property lines and too high. James felt that the proposed houses would significantly impact the neighbouring properties' privacy, safety, and enjoyment.

Sarah, speaking on behalf of Wei Wei Yu, a neighbour, mentioned that the variances requested for depth, height, and coverage would negatively impact their property by limiting the sunlight to the property and casting shadows throughout the day.

Member Sampson reminded the applicant that the Committee had to assess the proposals based on the zoning standards in place for the property, as had been discussed at previous meetings for other properties. Member Sampson had no issues with the consent but felt the proposed house size was too large for the lots and requested the applicant to reduce the floor area ratio to 55 percent or below, which would be consistent with previous approvals granted by the Committee.

Member Gutfreund agreed with their colleague that no extenuating circumstances had been presented that would necessitate a change to the consistent approach of this Committee to granting floor area ratio variances of no greater than 5 percent above the permitted floor area and the requested variance for floor area ratio be lowered to 55 percent or less.

Member Yan also agreed with their colleagues and considered the requests for height and floor area ratio combined to present considerable massing with significant impacts for the neighbours. Member Yan recognized the neighbourhood analysis conducted by the applicant but agreed that the consistent approach used by the Committee of granting floor area ratio increases of no greater than 5 percent should be maintained.

Ida Evangelista consulted with the owners, and given that the owners of 81 Woodward Avenue needed to proceed with the applications to meet insurance deadlines associated with the fire, they agreed to reduce the floor area ratio variance. Ida requested that the Committee consider approving the three minor variance applications with variance **c)** changed to reflect a floor area ratio of **55 percent (3643.75 square feet)**.

The Committee members agreed that the applications could be approved with reduced floor area ratios. Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/009/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**4. B/028/22**

**Agent Name: In Roads Consultants (Ida Evangelista)**  
**85 Woodward Avenue, Thornhill**  
**PLAN 2446 LOT 188 E PT LOT 189**

The applicant was requesting provisional consent to:

- a) **sever and convey** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 7.62 m (25 ft) and an approximate lot area of 325.16 m<sup>2</sup> (3499.99 ft<sup>2</sup>)(Part 3); and
- b) **retain** a parcel of land with an approximate lot frontage of 15.24 m (50 ft) and an approximate lot area of 650.32 m<sup>2</sup> (6999.99 ft<sup>2</sup>)(Part 4).

The purpose of this application was to sever and convey a portion of 85 Woodward Avenue (Part 3) with the intent to merge this parcel with the severed portion of 81 Woodward Avenue (B/009/22) (Part 2) to facilitate the creation of one new residential lot. This application was related to Consent Application B/009/22 and Minor Variance Applications A/245/22, A/246/22 and A/247/22, which are being reviewed concurrently.

Applications B/009/22, B/028/22, A/245/22, A/246/22, and A/247/22 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/009/22.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Patrick Sampson**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **B/028/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

5. **A/245/22**

**Agent Name: In Roads Consultants (Ida Evangelista)**  
**81 Woodward Avenue, Thornhill**  
**PLAN 2446 LOT 190 W PT LOT 189**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2237, as amended, to permit:

- a) **By-law 2237, Section 6.1:**  
a minimum east side yard setback of 1.56 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.80 metres for a two-storey dwelling;
- b) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2(iv):**  
a building depth of 19.01 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.8 metres;
- c) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (vii):**  
a floor area ratio of ~~56.8 percent (3,767 square feet)~~ **55% percent (3643.75 ft<sup>2</sup>)**, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 50 percent (3,313 square feet);
- d) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.1 (i):**  
a building height of 9.37 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building height of 8.6 metres; and
- e) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (ii):**  
a front yard setback of 8.49 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 10.7 metres;

as it related to a proposed two-storey single detached dwelling on the retained lot (Part 1).

Applications B/009/22, B/028/22, A/245/22, A/246/22, and A/247/22 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/009/22.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Jeamie Reingold**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/245/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6. **A/246/22**

**Agent Name: In Roads Consultants (Ida Evangelista)**  
**85 Woodward Avenue, Thornhill**  
**PLAN 2446 LOT 188 E PT LOT 189**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2237, as amended, to permit:

- a) **By-law 2237, Section 6.1:**  
a minimum east side yard setback of 1.58 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.80 metres for a two-storey dwelling;
- b) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2(iv):**  
a building depth of 19.01 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.80 metres;
- c) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (vii):**  
a floor area ratio of ~~57.7 percent (3,823 square feet)~~ **55% percent (3643.75 ft<sup>2</sup>)**, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 50 percent (3,313 square feet);
- d) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (i):**  
a building height of 9.57 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building height of 8.6 metres; and
- e) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2(ii):**  
a front yard setback of 8.39 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 10.7 metres;

as it related to a proposed two-storey single detached dwelling on the severed lot (Part 4).

Applications B/009/22, B/028/22, A/245/22, A/246/22, and A/247/22 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/009/22.

Member Reingold motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Jeamie Reingold**  
**Seconded by: Tom Gutfreund**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.



THAT Application No. **A/246/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

**7. A/247/22**

**Agent Name: In Roads Consultants (Ida Evangelista)  
85 Woodward Avenue, Thornhill  
PLAN 2446 LOT 188 E PT LOT 189**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2237, as amended, to permit:

- a) **By-law 2237, Section 6.1:**  
a minimum east side yard setback of 1.58 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.80 metres for a two-storey dwelling;
- b) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2(iv):**  
a building depth of 19.01 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.80 metres;
- c) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2(vii):**  
a floor area ratio of ~~57.7 percent (3,823 square feet)~~ **55% percent (3643.75 ft<sup>2</sup>)**, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 50 percent (3,313 square feet);
- d) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (i):**  
a building height of 9.57 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum building height of 8.6 metres; and
- e) **By-law 2237, Amending By-law 101-90, Section 1.2 (ii):**  
a front yard setback of 8.48 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 10.7 metres;

as it related to a proposed two-storey single detached dwelling on the severed lot (Parts 2 and 3).

Applications B/009/22, B/028/22, A/245/22, A/246/22, and A/247/22 were heard concurrently with the discussion recorded under B/009/22.

Member Gutfreund motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund  
Seconded by: Sally Yan**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application No. **A/247/22** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

Adjournment

**Moved by: Tom Gutfreund**  
**Seconded by: Patrick Sampson**

THAT the virtual meeting of the Committee of Adjustment was adjourned at 10:40 pm, and the next regular meeting would be held on May 1, 2024.

CARRIED

Original signed May 1, 2024

---

Secretary-Treasurer  
Committee of Adjustment

Original signed May 1, 2024

---

Chair  
Committee of Adjustment