



100 John West Way  
Aurora, Ontario  
L4G 6J1  
(905) 727-3123  
aurora.ca

Town of Aurora  
**Committee of Adjustment Report**  
No. MV-2026-04 to MV-2026-09

---

**Subject:** **Minor Variance Application**  
Starlane Homes  
186, 190, 194, 198, 202 & 206 Archerhill Circle  
Lots 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38, Plan 65M-4836  
Files: MV-2026-04, MV-2026-05, MV-2026-06, MV-2026-07,  
MV-2026-08 & MV-2026-09

**Prepared by:** **Felix Chau, Planner**

**Department:** Planning and Development Services

**Date:** March 12, 2026

---

## Application

The owner/applicant is requesting relief from the requirements of the Town's Comprehensive Zoning By-law 6000-17, as amended, to facilitate a detached dwelling on each lot. The following relief is being requested:

- a) Section 5.61(ii) of the Zoning By-law allows a maximum driveway width of 6.0 metres if the lot frontage is greater than or equal to 9.0 metres and less than 18.0 metres. The applicant is proposing driveway widths of 9.0 metres.

## Background

The subject variances are located within an approved Plan of Subdivision (2023) for the development of 138 single detached lots ("Archerhill Subdivision"). Town Council enacted three site specific zoning (Residential R3 (546), R4 (547) and R4 (548) Exception Zone) to facilitate the approved Plan of Subdivision. The subdivision features lots in various stages of construction, with some lots occupied, some under construction, and some lots having not applied for building permits. The installation of municipal servicing infrastructure and other related works are complete.

## **Subject Property and Area Context**

The subject lands are located south of Vandorf Sideroad and west of Bayview Avenue. The six (6) lots affected by the proposed variances are located on the northeastern portion of the subdivision, with rear yards abutting Bayview Avenue. The subject lots are currently vacant and have lot areas of approximately 465 square metres (5005 square feet) with lot frontages of 13.7 metres (45 feet).

## **Proposal**

The applicant is proposing to exceed the Zoning By-law's maximum driveway width provision on each of the six lots to 9.0m of driveway width, whereas the by-law requires a maximum of 6.0m.

## **Official Plan**

The subject properties are designated "Stable Neighbourhood" by the Town of Aurora Official Plan, which permits ground-related residential uses and accessory structures.

## **Zoning**

The subject properties are zoned "Detached Fourth Density Residential R4 (547) Exception Zone" within Zoning By-law 6000-17, as amended. This zone permits detached dwellings.

## **Related Planning Applications**

- ZBA-2021-06 & SUB-2021-02 – Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications to facilitate a 138-lot subdivision for detached dwellings were approved in 2023.
- PLC-2025-01 – Part Lot Control Exemption application to consolidate and subdivide 10 lots to create two additional lots (for a total of 12 lots) was approved in June 2025. This application facilitated a total of 140 lots in the Archerhill Subdivision.
- MV-2025-15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27 – Minor Variances were approved in July 2025 to reduce the minimum interior side yard setbacks of 1.2 metres on both interior side yards to 1.2 metres on one side and 0.65 metres on the other side was approved to facilitate detached dwellings on the 12 lots created through PLC-2025-01.

## **Preliminary Zoning Review**

A Preliminary Zoning Review (PZR) has been completed by the Town of Aurora's Building Division. The PZR identified the required variances, and no other non-compliance was identified.

### **Applicant's stated reason(s) for not complying with the Zoning By-law**

As stated on the application form:

"The requested relief pertains to Section 7.1 of the By-law to permit a driveway width and curb cut of 9.0 metres whereas the By-law prescribes a lesser maximum width of 6.0 metres for residential properties. The proposed driveway configuration is intended to address site-specific 3-car garage access to the single family dwelling. The minor variance is minor in nature, is appropriate for the development of the subject property, and maintains the general intent and purpose of both Zoning By-law and the Official Plan. The proposal will not result in any adverse impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood or streetscape. The increase in driveway width and curb cut is limited and represents a modest deviation from the By-law requirement. The variance will not create adverse impacts related to traffic operations, pedestrian safety, drainage, or the character of the streetscape".

## **Planning Comments**

Planning Staff have evaluated Minor Variance Application MV-2026-04, 05, 06, 07, 08 & 09 pursuant to the prescribed tests as set out in Section 45 (1) of the *Planning Act*, as follows:

### **a) The proposed variances do not meet the general intent of the Official Plan**

The intent of the Official Plan "Stable Neighbourhoods" designation is to ensure that residential neighbourhoods are protected from incompatible forms of development, while allowing the neighbourhoods to be enhanced and evolve over time. Section 7.5.1.3 (a) of the Official Plan states that site alteration abutting existing residential development shall be sympathetic to the form and character of the existing development and shall be compatible with regard to building scale and urban design.

The proposed expanded driveway widths should only be considered on lots where 3 car garages can be accommodated. Each of the subject lots only have a lot frontage of 13.7 metres, it was never intended to accommodate three-car garages with a 9.0 metre driveway width. The lack of separation between buildings and hardscaping in

the front yard would cause massing issues towards the streetscape. These lot frontage sizes are appropriately scaled for two-car garage dwellings with a 6.0 metre driveway width to allow for breaks in between the buildings and allow for a consistent streetscape.

The surrounding approved lots feature detached dwellings with garage faces and driveway widths that were scaled appropriately to their respective lot frontages. The proposed streetscape will be impacted as these lots will look disproportional compared to the neighbouring lots, which feature driveway widths scaled appropriately to their lot widths. This would result in an uneven ratio of softscape to hardscape along Archerhill Circle.

Expanding the driveway width for the purpose of allowing a three-car garage dwelling model where one was not previously considered contradicts the overall review of the subdivision. This has adverse impacts on the streetscape both aesthetically and functionally, due to the loss of approved on-street parking space and boulevard trees.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed variances do not meet the general intent of the Official Plan.

**b) The proposed variances do not meet the general intent of the Zoning By-law**

The subject properties are zoned "Detached Fourth Density Residential R4 (547) Exception Zone" within Zoning By-law 6000-17, as amended. The amending By-law for the Archerhill Subdivision created three separate residential exception zones catering for specific building specifications based on the lot sizes and frontages.

The intent of the maximum driveway width provision is to preserve the streetscape character, ensure proper drainage, and encourage the use of green spaces. The proposed variances to widen six driveway widths deviates from this.

Staff have concerns over the loss of on-street public parking availability resulting from the widened driveway widths. There is currently a total of six on-street parking spaces in front of these six lots. The proposed driveway widenings will reduce this to three spots. Furthermore, the approved subdivision restricts on-street parking on the opposite (west) side of Archerhill Circle, thus there is no additional parking spaces to make up for the loss. As a result, the loss of three on-street parking spaces significantly reduces the on-street parking supply in the general vicinity of the subject lots. The intention for on street parking is not only for the individual lots in question,

but for the subdivision as a whole to provide parking spaces for visitors. The applicant submitted a parking plan to justify the reduction, however Staff identified that parking spaces were inaccurately shown where on-street parking is restricted. The applicant did not provide an updated parking plan or any parking study in response.

The Town's Engineering Staff have provided comments indicating their concerns and opposition over the loss of pervious (grassed) areas and the impact to water balance and storm runoff. Furthermore, they have indicated that there are concerns about the widened driveway clearance impacting the location of two mainline valves approved through the Plan of Subdivision. The applicant did not provide any supplementary studies to address the potential impacts on drainage. Engineering Staff also have concerns regarding the loss of boulevard space for utilities. The subject lots only have 13.7 metres of frontage each. Increasing the driveways to 9.0 metres leaves only 4.7 metres of frontage for boulevard space, which represents about one-third of the total lot frontage. This limits the available space for future utility installations in the boulevard.

Additionally, the Town's Parks Staff have indicated their concerns and opposition regarding the loss of boulevard trees resulting from the widened driveways. The Town's Landscape Design Guidelines for new subdivisions require a minimum of one boulevard tree per lot. Staff do not agree with the expanded driveways at the expense of boulevard trees and front yard green space.

For these reasons, Staff is of the opinion that the requested variances do not meet the intention of the Zoning By-law.

**c) The proposed variances are not considered desirable for the appropriate development of the land**

The proposed widened driveway will result in an imbalanced streetscape in comparison with the neighbouring lots. The neighbouring lots to the north of the subject properties have larger lot frontages to accommodate for a 3-car garage dwelling. The lots to the south have similar sized lot frontages to the subject properties and only two-car garages are proposed.

While widening the driveway facilitates additional private parking spaces on the subject properties, the on-street parking supply is intended for public use within the subdivision. The loss of on-street parking supply within the subdivision is a concern,

and the applicant has not provided any adequate alternative parking solutions that conform with the approved subdivision.

The loss of the boulevard trees in the approved subdivision is a concern as the overall subdivision was approved with tree compensation requirements. Furthermore, The Town's urban forestry study, as endorsed by Council, recommends increasing the urban tree canopy where appropriate. Removing approved boulevard trees to expand the driveway widths would be in direct contradiction of this recommendation.

Staff is of the opinion that the requested variances are not desirable of the appropriate development of the land.

**d) The proposed variances are not considered minor in nature**

The question of the minor in nature of a proposed variance can be related to its scale and impact on adjacent properties.

The driveway width expansions will have impact on the overall streetscape of the subdivision by creating massing issue by limiting the spacing in between the buildings and driveways. The subject lots, with a 13.7 metre lot frontage, were intended for a two-car garage dwelling, with a maximum driveway width of 6.0 metres.

Furthermore, it is Engineering Staff's opinion that the proposed driveway expansions contradict the plans reviewed and approved through the Archerhill Subdivision in 2023. The applicant has not adequately justified how increased runoff and impact to approved locations of servicing to the satisfaction of Engineering Staff.

To develop the subdivision, existing trees were required to be removed. The approved locations of the boulevard tree coincide with the tree that was planted to compensate. The location of the trees was reviewed and approved with streetscape aesthetic in mind, in addition to increasing the overall urban tree canopy. The applicant has proposed to remove the boulevard tree with no plan or justification to relocate the trees.

Therefore, it is the opinion of Staff, the requested variances are not minor in nature.

## **Additional Comments**

The minor variance application was circulated to Town Department/Divisions and to external agencies for review and comment. The following comments were provided:

Department or Agency	Comments
Building Division	<p>Preliminary Zoning Review was completed.</p> <p>No comments.</p>
Engineering Division	<p>The Engineering Department is objecting to this driveway widening minor variance request for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of on-street parking spaces: There is currently a total of 6 on-street parking spaces in front of these 6 homes requesting driveway widenings. The proposed driveway widenings will reduce that on-street parking to 3 (loss of 3 spaces).</li> <li>2. Impact of driveway clearance to water service curbstops: The proposed #206 Archerhill driveway widening will encroach on the 1.2m minimum clearance to its water service curbstop.</li> <li>3. Loss of boulevard trees: There are a total of 5 proposed boulevard trees along the fronts of these 6 homes. All of them will be impacted by these proposed driveway widenings.</li> <li>4. Loss of pervious (grassed) area and impact to water balance and storm runoff: The 6 proposed driveway widenings will result in a significant loss of grassed area in front of these homes. This impacts the LID measures identified in the Infiltration Assessment and Water Balance Report as one of the LID measures is to direct roof drainage to grassed areas. The loss of front lawn area will also alter the runoff coefficients of the storm drainage catchment areas associated with these properties and negatively impact the water balance for this portion of the site.</li> <li>5. Loss of Boulevard Space for Utilities: These 6 lots only have 13.7m of frontage each. Increasing the driveways to 9m wide leaves just 4.7m of frontage for boulevard space (only 1/3 of the total</li> </ol>

	<p>frontage). This limits the available space for future utility installations in the boulevard.</p> <p>6. Uneven Ratio of Boulevard Space to Driveway Space: These 6 proposed driveway widenings will result in only 1/3 of the frontage remaining as front lawn space whereas the majority (2/3) of the frontage will be driveway. This a concern for overall aesthetics as well as for pedestrians using the sidewalk in front of these homes. Wider driveways increase crossing distance which increase pedestrian exposure to vehicles.</p>
Operational Services (Parks)	<p>The Landscape Design Guidelines for subdivisions require a minimum of 1 boulevard tree per lot. Further, our urban forestry study, as endorsed by Council, recommends increasing our urban tree canopy. Parks Staff don't agree with paving over our boulevards at the expense of losing tree canopy, so Parks Staff object to the variances.</p>
Operational Services (Public Works)	No comments.
Central York Fire Services	No comments.
York Region	No comments.
LSRCA	No objections.
Alectra	No objections.

### Public Correspondence

Written submissions were not received at the time of writing of this report. Should written submissions be received after the writing of this report, the Secretary Treasurer will provide the submission(s) to Committee members at the meeting.

## **Conclusion**

Planning staff have reviewed the application regarding Section 45 (1) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O, 1990, c.P.13, as amended, and believe that the requested variances do not meet the four tests of the *Planning Act* for granting minor variances. Staff recommend refusal of the requested variances.

## **Attachments**

Appendix 'A' – Site Plan