

**To:** Christine Vigneault, Committee of Adjustment Secretary Treasurer  
**From:** Nancy Tuckett, Senior Manager of Development Planning  
**Date:** September 30, 2021  
**Name of Owner:** Dmitry Baev and Ganna Tkachova  
**Location:** 53 Longbridge Road  
**File No.(s):** A097/21

---

**Proposed Variance(s):**

1. The minimum proposed front yard is 7.5 m.
2. To proposed exterior stairway extends into the required front yard to a maximum of 8.28 m.
3. The proposed exterior stairway in the front yard exceeds one-half storey in height.
4. The maximum proposed lot coverage is 26.63%.
5. The maximum proposed building height is 10.34 m.
6. The proposed private swimming pool in the rear yard is not entirely in the rear yard.
7. One of the proposed parking spaces in the attached garage is a minimum of 5.58 m long.

**By-Law Requirement(s):**

1. The minimum required front yard is 9 m. [4.1.9, Schedule A]
2. Exterior stairways may extend into a required front yard to a maximum of 1.8 m. [3.14c]
3. Exterior stairways shall be permitted in the rear yard only except that an exterior stairway not exceeding one-half storey in height shall be permitted in any yard. [3.14 b)]
4. The maximum permitted lot coverage is 20%. [4.1.9, Schedule A]
5. The maximum permitted building height is 9.5 m. [4.1.9, Schedule A]
6. A private swimming pool shall be constructed only in the rear yard. [4.1.1 i)]
7. The by-law defines a parking space as 'a rectangular area measuring at least 2.7 m by 6 m. [2.0, parking space]

**Official Plan:**

Vaughan Official Plan 2010 ('VOP 2010'): "Low-Rise Residential"

**Comments:**

The Owner is requesting permission to construct a two-storey single-detached dwelling and swimming pool with the above noted variances.

The Development Planning Department has no objection to Variance #1, as the proposed front yard setback of 7.5 m only applies to the covered and unenclosed porch, while the majority of the dwelling complies with the front yard setback requirement.

The Development Planning Department can support Variances #2 and #3, as the proposed length and height of the stairway are attributed to the existing and proposed grading on-site. The Owner (through their Agent) confirmed that landscaping will be planted along the front edge of the stairway as depicted in the front elevation drawing submitted with the application, to reduce its visual impact on the streetscape.

With respect to Variance #4, the Development Planning Department has historically supported variances with a maximum lot coverage of 23% in this area for two-storey dwellings. Exceptions where greater lot coverage have been supported is if a covered, unenclosed porch and/or patio is included in the total lot coverage calculation. As such, the Development Planning Department has no objection to the proposed maximum lot coverage of 26.63% as the main dwelling represents 23% of the total proposed lot coverage and the remaining 3.63% lot coverage is associated with the proposed covered and unenclosed front porch and rear patio, which are considered non-livable areas. The proposed maximum lot coverage of 26.63% is also consistent with previous approvals in the area.

With respect to Variance #5, the Development Planning Department initially had concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposed height and massing on the abutting property to the west, as the grading of this property is notably lower than that of

the subject property. In response, the Owner subsequently reduced the proposed maximum building height from 10.62 m to 10.34 m. The Owner has also confirmed that additional grading will be taking place along the west side of the subject property to match the grade of the abutting property so that the garage of the proposed dwelling will be constructed at a similar level as the existing garage of the abutting property. Therefore, the Development Planning Department can support Variance #5.

Variance #6 is required as the northerly portion of the pool is not situated in the rear yard as technically defined in By-law 1-88 but remains located in the rear yard amenity area and does not visually impact the streetscape.

Variance #7 is required to address a minor reduction in length (from 6 m to 5.58 m) for one parking space within the garage, which will be used as a storage area as illustrated on the basement floor plan. The Development Engineering Department has no concerns as the removal of one parking space within the garage does not cause a deficiency in parking spaces required.

In support of the application, the Owner submitted an Arborist Report, prepared by Redbud Forestry Consultants, dated April 16, 2021. Urban Design staff reviewed the report and are satisfied with the mitigation methods proposed for the existing trees. The Owner is advised that all private trees being removed or injured require a Tree Permit through the Parks, Forestry and Horticulture Operations Department.

The Development Planning Department is of the opinion that the proposal is minor in nature, maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, and is desirable for the appropriate development of the land.

**Recommendation:**

The Development Planning Department recommends approval of the application.

**Conditions of Approval:**

If the Committee finds merit in the application, the following conditions of approval are recommended:

None

**Comments Prepared by:**

Roberto Simbana, Planner I  
Letizia D'Addario, Senior Planner