Toronto Local Appeal Body

40 Orchard View Blvd, Suite 211 Toronto, Ontario M4R 1B9

Telephone: 416-392-4697
Fax: 416-696-4307
Email: tlab@toronto.ca
Website: www.toronto.ca/tlab

DECISION AND ORDER

Decision Issue Date: Monday, October 18, 2021

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

Appellant(s): MONICA SEGER VAN TOL

Applicant(s): ALI SHAKERI

Property Address/Description: 3 JAINEY PL

Committee of Adjustment File

Number(s): 20 141024 NNY 08 CO, 20 141027 NNY 08 MV,

20 141028 NNY 08 MV

20 214820 S45 08 TLAB, 20 214831 S45 08

TLAB Case File Number(s): TLAB

Hearing date: Monday, May 25, 2021 AND Thursday, June 10, 2021

Deadline Date for Closing Submissions/Undertakings:

DECISION DELIVERED BY S. MAKUCH

REGISTERED PARTIES AND PARTICIPANTS

Applicant ALI SHAKERI

Owner RICKY HORENFELDT

Appellant MONICA SEGER VAN TOL

Appellant's Legal Rep WILLIAM ROBERTS

Party RICKY HORENFELDT

Party's Legal Rep IAN ANDRES

Participant CHARLES ROY

Participant SHEILA DUNLOP

Participant ROBERT SEUMAS WOODS

Participant KEVIN WIDDIFIELD

Participant KAE EDWARDS

Participant JUDITH FOLDES

Expert Witness MICHELLE CHARKOW

Expert Witness TERRY MILLS

INTRODUCTION

This is an appeal of a decision of the Committee of Adjustment approving a consent and minor variances for the construction of a detached dwelling on each of the two new smaller lots to be created. The variances requested for the dwellings to be constructed on each of the two lots are set out in Appendix 1. They relate to a building height, lot coverage and height of the main door thresh holds above grade. The Plans showing the two lots and the site plan and elevations are found in Appendix 3.

BACKGROUND

The property to be subdivided is in the low density residential neighbourhood of Bedford Park, east of Avenue Rd. and south of Wilson Ave. A visit to the area shows that there is significant amount of redevelopment of the detached dwellings occurring in the area. Jainey Place is a street in the heart of the community. It has significant greenery and relatively low rise detached dwellings. The consent sought was not of concern on the appeal, which was brought by an adjacent neighbour and supported by a number of participating neighbours on Jainey Place and on the street immediately to the rear, Esgore Dr. The City did not appear as a party and City planning staff raised no concerns with respect to the consent or variances. However, the South Armour Heights Residents Association appeared in opposition.

MATTERS IN ISSUE

The matters in issue were limited in scope: lot frontage and lot size were not in issue, setbacks, depth and length of the dwellings were not of significant concern, and variances respecting the height of the pedestrian access to the dwellings were not pressed. The consent itself was not challenged.

The major issue was how the two dwellings would fit on Jainey Place. In this respect the issue was the height and shape of the dwellings because, it was argued, they are high and have flat roofs and thus will appear to have a large mass. It was postulated they do not fit on Jainey Place with its low rise houses and bucolic character while the height and flat roofs created two large buildings.

A major second issue was the possible destruction of two trees protected by the City's Tree Bylaw located on the property to the rear of the proposed dwellings. The question in respect to these trees was whether the buildings were designed to take into account their preservation. An additional issue raised was of whether there would be a significant shadow impact from the proposed dwellings.

Of course, in addition these particular issues are the issues of whether the consent meets the provisions of s. 53 of the *Planning Act* and whether the variances meet the requirements of s. 45 of the *Planning Act* and Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan.

JURISDICTION

Provincial Policy - S. 3

A decision of the Toronto Local Appeal Body ('TLAB') must be consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement ('PPS') and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for the subject area ('Growth Plan').

Consent - S. 53

TLAB must be satisfied that a plan of subdivision is not necessary for the orderly development of the municipality pursuant to s. 53(1) of the Act and that the application for consent to sever meets the criteria set out in s. 51(24) of the Act. These criteria require that " regard shall be had, among other matters, to the health, safety, convenience, accessibility for persons with disabilities and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the municipality and to,

- (a) the effect of development of the proposed subdivision on matters of provincial interest as referred to in section 2 of the Planning Act;
- (b) whether the proposed subdivision is premature or in the public interest;

- (c) whether the plan conforms to the official plan and adjacent plans of subdivision, if any;
- (d) the suitability of the land for the purposes for which it is to be subdivided;
- (d.1) if any affordable housing units are being proposed, the suitability of the proposed units for affordable housing;
- (e) the number, width, location and proposed grades and elevations of highways, and the adequacy of them, and the highways linking the highways in the proposed subdivision with the established highway system in the vicinity and the adequacy of them;
- (f) the dimensions and shapes of the proposed lots;
- (g) the restrictions or proposed restrictions, if any, on the land proposed to be subdivided or the buildings and structures proposed to be erected on it and the restrictions, if any, on adjoining land;
- (h) conservation of natural resources and flood control;
- (i) the adequacy of utilities and municipal services;
- (j) the adequacy of school sites;
- (k) the area of land, if any, within the proposed subdivision that, exclusive of highways, is to be conveyed or dedicated for public purposes;
- (I) the extent to which the plan's design optimizes the available supply, means of supplying, efficient use and conservation of energy; and
- (m) the interrelationship between the design of the proposed plan of subdivision and site plan control matters relating to any development on the land, if the land is also located within a site plan control area designated under subsection 41 (2) of this Act or subsection 114 (2) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006. 1994, c. 23, s. 30; 2001, c. 32, s. 31 (2); 2006, c. 23, s. 22 (3, 4); 2016, c. 25, Sched. 4, s. 8 (2).

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 evidence at the hearing was presented by two qualified planners, one in favour of the proposal, Ms. Charkow, and the other, Mr. Mills, in favour of the appellant. In addition, as noted above, there was evidence from a number of neighbours and a representative of the South Armour Heights Residents Association in opposition to the variances. A report filed with the Committee of Adjustment stated that "Staff are of the opinion that the consent application and related minor variance applications are generally in keeping with the existing physical character of Jainey Place"

Ms. Charkow's evidence supported staff's position. Her evidence questioned the very essence of the appeal itself, as she asked "What are we fighting about?' It was her opinion that the proposed dwellings would fit well on Jainey Place, and that the flat roof lessens the massing of the dwellings in comparison to an as of right building with a mansard roof. Her opinion was also that the height variance would be imperceptible. The lot coverage variance she opined was marginal with many such variances approved for the area. She pointed out some very minor reductions in the variances to the southern lot, Lot 3A. No notice was required of those changes. She also gave evidence that: the variances were numerically minor resulting in visibly imperceptible impact; and that there were no privacy or overlook issues. A shadow study showed no significant shadow impact and in her opinion the proposed dwellings would fit architecturally in the immediate context of Jainey Place and the wider context of the neighbourhood as there are a variety of roof types, including flat roofs.

Mr. Mills, the other professional witnesses in opposition, held contrary views. Mr. Mills conceded that his evaluation was subjective. He felt that two tall buildings with flat roofs would have a "pronounced appearance" on a Jainey Place because it was a "small short street". He opined that the dwellings would not harmonize with the street scape unless the roofs were sloped. He stated that the roofs should be sloped as this would reduce the massing of the dwellings as the roofs were "totally wrong". On cross examination he conceded that the lot coverage, frontage, and area were not issues and that the height of the front door threshold was also not an issue. He believed that a dwelling, close by at 35 Haddington with a similar height variance did not fit in the neighbourhood.

Other witnesses in opposition supported Mr. Mills but two witnesses, Mr. Woods, a neighbour to the rear, and Ms. Harrison Dunlop of the residents Association added a concern that a Honey Locust tree and a Norway Maple in the rear yard and would be destroyed. It was clear that an application had been made to destroy both trees and that the application had been refused.

ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, REASONS

I conclude based on the evidence that the consent should be granted. The provisions of s. 53 are met. I find, also, that the variances should be granted as they cumulatively and individually meet the requirements of the four tests of the *Planning Act* and the Growth Plan and PPS. In particular the proposed development respects and reinforces the physical character of the neighbourhood as it will result in two low density detached dwellings which are not unusual and in particular will fit in in terms of height, and density. Moreover, the proposal is a more efficient use of land as it places two dwellings where there was only one.

Most of the evidence to the contrary was based on the architectural character of the dwellings; i.e. the type of roof. I find that roof type is not a characteristic relevant under the Official Plan. Under the Official Plan, variances must "respect and reinforce the physical character of the neighbourhood". In this case, roof type is not a physical characteristic of the neighbourhood. There are a variety of roof types including flat roofs. It is not at all clear that a flat roof would not fit on Jainey Place simply because it is a "small short street" in this neighbourhood. Indeed, upon visiting the neighbourhood and seeing a variety of roof types and dwelling heights and street and block lengths I am not at all certain the length of Jainey Place matters and why it is described as small in addition to short. I do note, however, that there was little evidence that its verdant character would be affected by the variances. Moreover, it is not at all clear based on the evidence that the height would be out of character.

I do, however, have a concern about the preservation of the two trees to the rear of the dwellings. It is not clear that the dwellings were designed to ensure the trees would not be destroyed. Indeed, an application was made to destroy them. In addition to Urban Forestry's request for a condition respecting trees, I will add a condition that construction does not destroy the trees in question, which are in the rear yard. I do this in keeping with s.3.1(d) of the Official Plan which encourages the protection of trees

DECISION AND ORDER

The appeal is hereby dismissed and the variances set out in Appendix 1 are approved subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2.

S. Makuch

Panel Chair, Toronto Local Appeal

Sal, Kr. Malane

APPENDIX 1

Variances

3A Jainey Place

City of Toronto Zoning by-law

- 1. The permitted maximum lot coverage is 35.0 percent of the lot area. The proposed lot coverage is 36.9 percent of the lot area.[10.20.30.40.(1) Maximum Lot Coverage]
- 2. The permitted maximum height is 7.2 metres. The proposed height is 9.06 metres.[10.20.40.10.(4) Restrictions for a Detached House with a Flat or Shallow Roof]
- 3. The permitted maximum height of the first floor above established grade is 1.2 metres. The proposed height of the first floor above established grade is 1.44 metres.[10.20.40.10.(6) Height of First Floor Above Established Grade]

North York Zoning by-law

4. The maximum permitted building height is 8.0m. The proposed building height is 9.13m. [14-B(8) - Maximum Building Height]

3B Jainey Place

City of Toronto Zoning By-law

- 1. Chapter 10.20.30.40.(1), By-law No. 569-2013 The maximum permitted lot coverage is 35.00% of the lot area. The proposed lot coverage is 38.00% of the lot area.
- 2. Chapter 10.20.40.10. By-law No. 569-2013 The maximum permitted building height is 7.2m. The proposed building height is 9.1m.
- 3. Chapter 10.20.40.10.(6), By-law No. 569-2013 The permitted maximum height of the main pedestrian entrance is 1.2m above Established Grade. The proposed height of the main pedestrian entrance is 1.47m above Established Grade. North York Zoning By-law
- 4. Section 14-B(8), By-law No. 7625 The maximum permitted building height is 8.0m. The proposed building height is 9.13m.

APPENDIX 2 CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Schedule A: Standard Consent Conditions

The Consent Application is approved on Condition

The TLAB has considered the provisions of Section 51(24) of the Planning Act and is satisfied that a plan of subdivision is not necessary. The TLAB therefore consents to the transaction as shown on the plan filed with the TLAB or as otherwise specified by this Decision and Order, on the condition that before a Certificate of Official is issued, as required by Section 53(42) of the Planning Act, the applicant is to fulfill the following conditions to the satisfaction of the Deputy Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment:

- (1) Confirmation of payment of outstanding taxes to the satisfaction of the Revenue Services Division, in the form of a statement of tax account current to within 30 days of an applicant's request to the Deputy Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment to issue the Certificate of Official as outlined in Condition 6.
- (2) Municipal numbers for the subject lots, blocks, parts, or otherwise indicated on the applicable registered reference plan of survey shall be assigned to the satisfaction of the Supervisor, Surveys, Engineering Support Services, Engineering and Construction Services.
- (3) One electronic copy of the registered reference plan of survey integrated to NAD 83 CSRS (3 degree Modified Transverse Mercator projection), delineating by separate Parts the lands and their respective areas, shall be filed with, and to the satisfaction of, the Manager, Land and Property Surveys, Engineering Support Services, Engineering and Construction Services.
- (4) One electronic copy of the registered reference plan of survey satisfying the requirements of the Manager, Land and Property Surveys, Engineering Support Services, Engineering and Construction Services shall be filed with the Deputy Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment.
- (5) Prepare and submit a digital draft of the Certificate of Official, Form 2 or 4, O. Reg. 197/96, referencing either subsection 50(3) or (5) of the Planning Act if applicable as it pertains to the conveyed land and/or consent transaction to the satisfaction of the Deputy Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment.
- (6) Once all of the other conditions have been satisfied, the applicant shall request, in writing, that the Deputy Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee of Adjustment issue the Certificate of Official.

(7) Within ONE YEAR of the date of the giving of this notice of decision, the applicant shall comply with the above-noted conditions.

The variances are subject to the following condition:

- 1)The applicant shall submit revised site plan with the following notations to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Construction Services and Transportation Services, at no cost to the City;
- 2) "The applicant shall submit a Municipal Road Damage Deposit (MRDD) prior to obtaining a Building Permit." The applicant is advised to contact Mr. Gavin Mendes of our Right-of-Way Management Section at (416) 395-7431 regarding municipal road damage deposit requirements; and, 3) "The applicant shall obtain the necessary authorizations and permits from the City's Right-of-Way Management Section of the Transportation Services before excavating within or encroaching into the municipal road allowance".
- 4) Urban Forestry may request design revisions to the rear walk up of #3B to preserve a rear bylaw protected tree.
- 5) No construction shall occur which would destroy the Honey Locust and/or the Norway Maple trees in the rear yard.
- 6) Construction shall be substantially in accordance with the plans in Appendix 3 and subject to condition 5 above.

APPENDIX 3 PLANS





















