

**Toronto Local Appeal Body** 

40 Orchard View Blvd, Suite 211 Toronto, Ontario M4R 1B9 Telephone: 416-392-4697 Fax: 416-696-4307 Email: <u>tlab@toronto.ca</u> Website: <u>www.toronto.ca/tlab</u>

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

**Decision Issue Date** 

Thursday, June 03, 2021

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER Section 45(12), subsection 45(1) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (the "Act")

Appellant(s): XUE FANG WANG

Applicant(s): LIN LAN

Property Address/Description: 217 RHODES AVE

Committee of Adjustment File

Number(s): 19 213572 STE 14 MV

#### TLAB Case File Number(s): 20 188016 S45 14 TLAB

Hearing date: May 18, 2021

#### DECISION DELIVERED BY STANLEY MAKUCH

#### **APPEARANCES**

Name	Role	Representative		
Lin Lan	Applicant			
Xue Fang Wang	Owner/Appellant	Jonathan Benczkowski		
Nicole Plooard	Participant			
Kevin Gilmour	Participant			
Katie Gilmour	Participant			
Sophie Nunnelley	Participant			
Deborah Brown	Participant			

#### Decision of Toronto Local Appeal Body Panel Member: S. MAKUCH TLAB Case File Number: 20 188016 S45 14 TLAB

### INTRODUCTION

This is an appeal from a decision of the Committee of Adjustment refusing variances to permit the construction of a new three-storey detached dwelling with an integral garage, rear ground floor deck, and front and rear third storey terraces. A minor amendment was made to the application in that the number of variances requested have been reduced by two as a variance respecting front yard open space and a valance respecting height were removed from the application. The revised list of variances now sought is set out in Appendix 1.

### BACKGROUND

Although there were a number of persons who requested participant status at the hearing, the only party appearing was the applicant and their representatives. There was, therefore, no opposition at the hearing. Moreover, a City Planning Report before the Committee of Adjustment expressed no opposition to the application.

### **MATTERS IN ISSUE**

In the absence of any opposition at the TLAB hearing there were no issues raised at the hearing. On an appeal, however, an applicant must demonstrate that the variances meet provincial requirements and the four tests of the Planning Act; all set out below under jurisdiction.

## JURISDICTION

#### **Provincial Policy – S. 3**

A decision of the Toronto Local Appeal Body (TLAB) must be consistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement ('PPS') and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for the subject area 'Growth Plan).

#### Variance – S. 45(1)

In considering the applications for variances from the Zoning By-laws, the TLAB Panel must be satisfied that the applications meet all of the four tests under s. 45(1) of the Act. The tests are whether the variances:

- maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan;
- maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-laws;
- are desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land; and
- are minor.

## EVIDENCE

The only evidence presented at the hearing was that of Mr. J. Benczkowski, a qualified land use planner who has given opinion evidence before TLAB on numerous occasions. He gave oral evidence to confirm his written witness statement filed February 5, 2021 which gave detailed evidence that the reduced list of variances cumulatively and individually met the four tests of the Planning Act and the PPS and the Growth Plan. He also gave evidence that the condition requested by Urban Forestry in its report to the Committee of Adjustment and the condition recommended by City Planning to the Committee should also be imposed. These two reports are also in the TLAB file.

## ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, REASONS

I find the written, uncontradicted evidence of Mr. Benczkowski sufficient and detailed enough to allow the appeal and to grant the variances ultimately requested and stated in his filed witness statement and found in Appendix 1. The following minor changes were made to the proposal following the Committee of Adjustment Refusal of the application:

The height of the proposed dwelling be reduced by .2m.

As a result of the lowering of the top of the roof, the main wall height was reduced by .05m.

The variance for front yard soft landscaping is removed. No notice is required of them.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The appeal is allowed, in part, and the variances in Appendix 1 are approved subject to the conditions in Appendix 2.

Saly K. Maland

S. Makuch Panel Chair, Toronto Local Appeal

## **APPENDIX 1**

1. Chapter 10.10.40.10.(1)(A) By-law 569-2013 The maximum permitted height of a detached dwelling is 10 m. The new three-storey detached dwelling will be 10.05 m in height.

2. Chapter 10.10.40.10.(2)(A)(i)&(ii) By-law 569-2013 The maximum permitted height of all front and rear exterior main walls is 7.5 m. The new three-storey detached dwelling will have front and rear exterior main wall heights of 8.95 m.

3. Chapter 10.10.40.40.(1)(A) By-law 569-2013

The maximum permitted floor space index is 0.6 times the area of the lot (153.6 m2). The new three-storey detached dwelling will have a floor space index of 0.99 times the area of the lot (253 m2).

4. Chapter 10.5.40.60.(7) By-law 569-2013

Roof eaves may project a maximum of 0.9 m provided that they are no closer than 0.3 m to a lot line. In this case, the roof eaves will be located 0.15 m from the south side lot line.

1. Section 4(2) By-law 438-86

The maximum permitted height of a detached dwelling is 10 m.

The new three-storey detached dwelling will be 10.05 m in height.

The following minor changes were made to the proposal following the Committee of Adjustment Refusal of the application:

I. The height of the proposed dwelling be reduced by .2m.

II. As a result of the lowering of the top of the roof, the main wall height was reduced by .05m.

III. The variance for front yard soft landscaping be removed.

#### Decision of Toronto Local Appeal Body Panel Member: S. MAKUCH TLAB Case File Number: 20 188016 S45 14 TLAB

## **APPENDIX 2**

1. Where there is no existing street tree, the owner shall provide payment in lieu of planting of one street tree on the City road allowance abutting each of the sites involved in the application. The current cash-in-lieu payment is \$583/tree.

2. The dwelling shall be constructed substantially in accordance with the plans attached below: Add plans found in Benczkowsk's witness statement filed Feb 5 2021 with TLAB. - Proposed: site plan A002, West elevation A304, East elevation A303, North elevation 302, South Elevation 301



_		
$\square$	General Notes	$\supset$ )
FILE	NO	
FILE	NO.	
SEAL		
	BROFESSIONAL BLLAN 100041647 November 20, 2019 November 20, 2019 November 20, 2019	
1 No.	ISSUED FOR ZONING CERTIFICATE Revision/Issue	1/11/20 Date
<b>F</b> DESIGN		
o/a 100 Tor	FDL Design & Construction Consilium Place, Suit 200 Dato, ON M1H 3E3	
NE	Name and Address W HOUSE 7 Rhodes Avenue	
То	ronto tario	
Drawin	ª ™• oposed Site Plan	$\prec$
Scale 1: Drawin	200 Date 11.01.2 9 Number 002	2020
	102	I



General Notes	١
FILE NO.	I
SEAL	
November 20, 2019 NOVEMBER 20,	
1     ISSUED FOR ZONING CERTIFICATE     1/11/20       No.     Revision/Issue     Date	
Free Name and Address Figure 1 (1997) Figure 1 (1997) Free Name and Address Project Name and Address New House 217 Rhodes Avenue Toronto Ontario	
Drawing The Proposed South Elevation   Scale Date   1:100 11.01.2020   Drawing Number A301	



## PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION

	FILE	NO.
	SEAL	-
		ENG
		LICI
SHED GRADE,	1 No.	ISSI
2	Firm 1	lame c
	F	D
	HII o/a	KUA FDI
	100 Tor	onto
	Projec Ne 21	
	То	ron
		tar

General Notes
FILE NO.
SEAL
[]
SO PROFESSIONAL ENG
L LAN
100041647 November 20, 2019
3 OVINCE OF ONTRE
1 ISSUED FOR ZONING CERTIFICATE 1/11/20
No. Revision/Issue Date
Firm Name and Address
<b>F D L</b> DISTORT A CONSTRUCTION HIKUA Inc.
o/a FDL Design & Construction 100 Consilium Place, Suit 200 Toronto, ON M1H 3E3
Project Name and Address
New House 217 Rhodes Avenue Toronto
Ontario
Drawing Title Proposed North Elevation Scale
1:100 11.01.2020 Draving Number A302

# PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION





## PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION



