

PLANNING REPORT #22/03 for the TOWNSHIP OF GUELPH ERAMOSA

CofA A08-21- 169 Scots Ln

Prepared by the County of Wellington Planning and Development Department in our capacity as planning consultants for the Township

MEETING DATE: January 26th, 2022

TO: Chair and Members of the Committee of Adjustment

Township of Guelph Eramosa

FROM: Zach Prince, Senior Planner

County of Wellington

SUBJECT: MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION A08-21 (Barrand)

169 Scots Lane

Ward 4

ATTACHMENTS: 1 – Grading Plan provided by the applicant

We have reviewed the application for minor variance and provide the following comments; please note the following comments are provided without the benefit of a site visit.

Recommendation

Be it resolved that the Committee of Adjustment of the Township of Guelph/Eramosa has received the following Planning Report regarding MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION A08-21 – 169 Scots Lane, and;

The relief being requested as part of Application A07-21 be approved as follows:

1. Relief from Section 5.2 of By-law No. 34/1995 to permit a driveway setback of 0.25 m (0.82 ft) where 1 m (3.2 ft) is required.

Background

The purpose of this application is to recognize an existing driveway in Rockwood as seen in **Figure 1**. The applicant has constructed a new driveway located 0.25 m from the property line. Prior to widening the driveway, the setback was 0.6 m, which was an existing condition since the home was constructed in 2003. Recently the owner has reconstructed and widened the driveway and this change resulted in a reduced setback to 0.25 m from the side yard lot line. The property is zoned R1-2 in the Guelph/Eramosa Zoning By-law 34-95 which is applicable to Rockwood South Subdivision.

The details of the minor variance application are included in the table below:

Regulation	By-law Section	Required	Proposed	Relief Requested
Driveway	5.2	1 m	0.25 m	0.75 m
Setback		(3.3 ft)	(0.8 ft)	(2.5 ft)



Figure 1 - Subject Property

Our discussion of this application relative to the four tests under the Planning Act is as follows:

Our discussion of this application relative to the four tests under the Planning Act is as follows:			
Four Tests	Discussion:		
That the requested variance is minor in nature	 The applicant is requesting to recognize an existing condition. Prior to replacing the driveway the setback was less than permitted in the zoning by-law but was consistent with the surrounding driveways. The Township Public Works department has confirmed that the reduced setback still provides enough room to have no impacts on the neighbouring property, provided the area is appropriately graded. 		
That the intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law is maintained	 The subject lands are zoned Residential (R1-2) within the Zoning Bylaw and are situated in Rockwood. A detached dwelling is a permitted use within this zone. The intent of the side yard driveway setback is to ensure that drainage can be addressed on the subject property and to create a sense of consistency within the surrounding neighbourhood. Based on the grading plan provided by the owner and reviewed by the public works department the widened driveway and the resulting reduced setback is not anticipated to have negative 		

	impacts on the neighbouring property with respects to drainage
That the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan is maintained	 The property is designated as Residential, which permits dwellings. Driveway widths and setbacks are controlled through the Township's zoning By-law.
That the variance is desirable for the appropriate development and use of the land, building or structure	 The reconstructed driveway and the increase in the driveway width allows for easier vehicular passage between the side of the house to access the existing garage located at the rear of the property. The front yard remains landscaped and the widening is in towards the side yard lot line. Subject to appropriate grading the additional width would have no negative effects on neighbouring properties.

Agency Comments

• Building Department: No Comments

• **GRCA:** No Comments

• Fire Department: No Comments

Wellington Source Water Protection:

 Public Works: I have reviewed the December 23, 2021, Planning circulation for the above noted Minor Variance application. The nature of the variance is to permit a reduced side yard setback for a driveway.

I have reviewed the supporting materials and have no objection provided the driveway is graded as proposed such that the adjacent property experiences no negative drainage impacts.

Planning Comment

An additional variance for driveway width was initially included as a variance on this application, as the length in front of the garage is 7.05 m where the By-law states the driveway shall not exceed 6 m in width. Through additional review with Township staff, it was confirmed that this variance is no longer required as part of this application because of the orientation of the garage therefore the area in front of the garage may be considered also as length. The width of the driveway along the side of the house to access the garage in the rear is approximately 3 m.

Regarding the reduced side yard setback, a grading plan has been included as **Attachment 1** which has been reviewed by the Township's Public Works Director. Subject to the grading plan being constructed, as noted by the Director, and provided there is enough space to appropriately grade without impacting the neighbouring property, Planning Staff also have no concerns.

Respectfully submitted

County of Wellington Planning and Development Department

Zach Prince RPP MCIP, Senior Planner

Reviewed by

Township of Guelph Eramosa CAO

Ian Roger, P.Eng.

CAO

ATTACHMENT 1: Grading Plan provided by the applicant

SKETCH FOR BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION LOT 12, REGISTERED PLAN 61M-77 TOWNSHIP OF GUELPH-ERAMOSA SCALE: 1 - 250 CAUTION: -THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY AND SHALL NOT BE USED FOR TRANSACTION OR MORTGAGE PURPOSES. NOTE: LOT DIMENSIONS ARE AS SHOWN ON REGISTERED PLAN 61M-77 AND HAVE NOT BEEN VERIFIED BY SURVEY. PROPOSED BUILDING POSTFOWED BY CALCULATION, NOT BY ACTUAL SURVEY - THIS SKETCH IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT. TOP OF FOUNDATION = 368.00 - THIS LOT MAY CONTAIN STRUCTURAL FILL UNDERSIDE OF FOOTING = 365.48 BASEMENT FLOOR = 365.71 FINISHED FLOOR = 368.25 ZONING: R1 FRONT YARD — 4.50 MIN. TO PORCH SIDE YARD — 1.20 MIN. (ONE SIDE) SIDE YARD — 1.50 MIN. (OTHER SIDE) REAR YARD — 7.50 MIN. COVERAGE — 35% MAX. GARAGE CUT = 0.60 TOP OF FOUNDATION @ REAR LEFT TO GRADE = 123 (214") 1.67m REAR RIGHT TO GRADE = 125 (214") 0.80m FRONT RIGHT TO GRADE = 0.20 (8") FRONT LEFT TO GRADE = 0.39 (15") As-built grade shots of the new driveway SCOTS LANE are in blue (12.0 METRES WIDE) 36724 367,12 CB V&B● SLEWATIONS WE ENSTIND SLEWATIONS TONEN ANDER 11, 2004 139'58'00"E 3:1 Max 367.40 347.37 367.42 367.26 .8% 64DRIVE 5% Max slope 04 367.80 367.61 367.36 367.55 367.40 200 PROPOSED **DWELLING** AREA= 184.23m2 DRIV 367.14 COVERAGE = 33% 6 367.43 367.27 366.89 N50.02'00"W 67.3**367.40** 5 366.79 5.4% 367.20 366.93 国 AREA=561.86m2 Our garage has substantial cracks in the foundation here... I wonder why 366.76 This as-built data from the This should not of been approved a developer is incorrect. When we the plot plan stage, there is minimal 366.80 moved in back in 2003, our support for our garage foundation. I understand if its a walkout lot with backyard was at a constant slope 366.50 from back of foundation to PL.. 3:1 slope parallel with the foundatio 2.0m UNDISTURBED AREA completely un-useable! but situated like this - where is the 366.50 15.240 N39"57"55"E 366.00 support? Based on the cracking, I highly doubt the footing is deeper to compensate for this slope. HALFYLOT CONCESSION 5 TML FOR: ASHTON RIDGE HOMES 2003-10:326m -Eram\81M-77\ACAD\P12.dwg VAN HARTEN SURVEYING INC. PROJECT NO. 15277-02 ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS

PLANNING REPORT 22/03 for the TOWNSHIP OF GUELPH ERAMOSA A08 - 21 (Barrand) January 26th, 2022 | page 4

DATE:

MAY 29, 2003