



PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES

Town of Newmarket

395 Mulock Drive

P.O. Box 328, STN Main

Newmarket, ON L3Y 4X7

www.newmarket.ca

planning@newmarket.ca

T: 905.953.5321

F: 905.953.5140

Planning Report

TO: Committee of Adjustment

FROM: Ted Horton, MCIP, RPP
Planner

DATE: August 12, 2019

RE: Application for Minor Variance **D13-A16-19**
371 Otton Road
Made by: KNOOP, Daniel and Jodi-Lynn

1. Recommendations:

That Minor Variance Application D13-A16-19 be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the variance pertains only to the request as submitted with the application; and
2. That the development be substantially in accordance with the information submitted with the application.

2. Application:

An application for minor variance has been submitted by the above-noted owner to request relief from Zoning By-law Number 1981-96, as amended by By-law Numbers 1984-13, 2002-94 and 2003-121, in order to allow a residential accessory structure (cabana) to be constructed closer to the side lot line in the rear yard than is permitted by the by-law.

The above-described property (herein referred to as the "subject lands") is located in a residential neighbourhood, specifically east of Bathurst Street and south of Alex Doner Drive. The subject lands contain a single detached home and are surrounded by similar single-detached homes.

3. Planning considerations:

The applicant is requesting relief in order to permit a side yard setback of 1.22 metres from a residential accessory structure to the side lot line in order to construct a cabana that is closer to the side lot line than a structure of its height is typically allowed. The relief requested is presented below.

Relief	By-law	Section	Requirement	Proposed
1	1981-96	6.2	A residential accessory structure between 2.4m and 4.6m in height must be set back a minimum of 2.4m from the side lot line	A residential accessory structure up to 4.0m in height to be set back a minimum of 1.22m from the side lot line

In making a recommendation to the Committee, staff are required to consider the 4 tests under the *Planning Act*; staff offer the following comments:

3.1 Conformity with the general intent of the Official Plan

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential – Oak Ridges Moraine” in the Town’s Official Plan. The objectives of the designation are to sustain and enhance the character and identity of existing residential communities and encourage the preservation and maintenance of the Town’s existing housing stock, and to ensure that development is managed in a way that protects the valuable Oak Ridges Moraine aquifer. This designation permits single detached dwellings, and allows for accessory buildings normally associated with residential uses. This test is met.

3.2 Conformity with the general intent of the Zoning By-law

The subject lands are zoned Single Family Detached Second Density (R2/S) by the By-laws cited above. A single detached dwelling is permitted in this zone, and residential accessory structures such as sheds are permitted subject to certain setbacks.

The general intent of setbacks are to ensure that the use of a property does not infringe on the rights of neighbours, and to allow sufficient space for light, sunshine, storm water run-off, and movement around the home. In the case of the subject lands, the residential accessory structure will be closer to the lot line than a structure normally would be. However, the proposed reduced setback appears to maintain a functional space and distance from the lot line that is sufficient for runoff. This test is met.

3.3 Desirable development of the lot

It is generally desirable to allow a property owner to invest in their property and arrange it in a manner that suits their needs, subject to the limits of the zoning by-law and impacts on neighbouring properties. This deference is balanced against the desirability of development in the public interest when permission beyond that of the zoning by-law is sought by way of a minor variance.

The requested relief provides for a structure that is within the general size and height limits for a residential accessory structure, and appears to continue to maintain sufficient distance to avoid adverse impact on adjacent properties. This test is met.

3.4 Minor nature of the variances

When considering if the variance is minor, it is not simply the numerical value nor is impact the sole test. Requested relief may not be minor even if no other property is impacted. The proposed residential accessory structure is not out of keeping with common rear yard accessory structures and is not expected to adversely impact neighbouring properties. This test is met.

In consideration of the above, the proposed variance meets the four tests under the *Planning Act*.

4. Other comments:

4.1 Tree Protection

The applicant has indicated that there are no trees on or within the prescribed radius of the lot that would be defined as significant under the Town’s Tree Policy.

4.2 Heritage

No structure on the lot is designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

4.3 Effect of public input

No public input was received as of the date of writing this report.

4.4 Interim Control By-law

On January 21st, 2019 Council adopted an Interim Control By-law under Section 38 of the *Planning Act*. The Interim Control By-law limits the ability to increase the floor area or height of residential dwellings throughout its study area, which includes the lands subject to this minor variance application. The Interim Control By-law does not prohibit residential accessory structures and as such has no bearing on this application.

4.5 Commenting agencies and departments

The Chief Building Official has no objection to the application.

Comments from Engineering Services were not available as of the date of writing this report.

The Regional Municipality of York has no comment on the application.

5. Conclusions:

The relief as requested:

- (1) is minor in nature;
- (2) conforms to the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law; and
- (3) is considered a desirable development of the lot.

Respectfully submitted,



Ted Horton, MCIP, RPP
Planner