

Filing Date: April 14, 2021

Hearing Date: May 11, 2021

File: A-2021-0097

**Owner/
Applicant:** **BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU & MANDEEP SANDHU**

Address: **39 BELLFLOWER LANE**

Ward: 8

Contact: François Hémon-Morneau, Planner I

Recommendations:

That application A-2021-0097 is not supportable

Background:

Existing Zoning:

The property is zoned 'Residential – Section 1157 (R1D – 1157)', *according to By-law 270-2004, as amended.*

Requested Variance:

The applicant is requesting the following variance:

1. To permit a driveway width of 9.75 m (32 ft.), whereas the By-law permits a maximum driveway width of 6.71 m (22 ft.).

Current Situation:

1. Maintains the General Intent and Purpose of the Official Plan

The subject property is designated 'Residential' in the Official Plan and 'Low Density Residential' in the Bramalea North Industrial Secondary Plan (Area 13). The requested variances have no impact within the context of the policies of the Official Plan or the Secondary Plan.

2. Maintains the General Intent and Purpose of the Zoning By-law

The request variance is to permit a driveway width of 9.75 m (32 ft.), whereas the By-law permits a maximum driveway width of 6.71 m (22 ft.).

The intent of the By-law in regulating the maximum permitted driveway width is to ensure that the driveway does not dominate the front yard landscaped area and that the driveway does not allow an excessive number of vehicles to be parked in front of the dwelling. The proposed driveway width is 3.04 m (10 ft.) wider than what the By-law permits. Given the southern portion of the driveway located between 39 and 41 Bellflower Lane is hard landscape, the proposed widening of the driveway would result in a substantial loss of the soft landscaped area in the front yard. In this case, the additional width also allows for several vehicles to be parked side by side across the driveway, which is contrary to the intent of the by-law. Further, the intent of the Zoning By-law in regulating maximum driveway width is to ensure that driveway does not visually dominate the streetscape. In this case, the cumulative impact of the existing driveway with the proposed widening would result in an extensive hardscaped area that is noticeable along the street. The variance does not meet the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law.

3. Desirable for the Appropriate Development of the Land

The requested variance to widen the driveway would result in the removal of soft landscaping and create adverse visual impact to the streetscape. Traffic Services Staff have identified that an existing utility box located on the north side of the property and which is not shown on the site plan drawings, would require a minimum setback of 1.2 m (3.93 ft.) from the driveway. Given the location of the utility box and the likelihood that this variance would reflect a change which is not compatible with the character of the area, the requested variance is not desirable for the appropriate development of the land.

4. Minor in Nature

The requested variance to allow an increase in the driveway width will create adverse visual impacts to the streetscape. The variance is not considered minor in nature.

Respectfully Submitted,

François Hémon-Morneau

François Hémon-Morneau, Planner I