



CITY OF MARKHAM
Virtual Meeting

December 10, 2025
7:00 pm

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

Minutes

The 20th regular meeting of the Committee of Adjustment for the year 2025 was held at the time and virtual space above with the following people present:

Arrival Time

Arun Prasad, Chair	7:00 pm
Jeanie Reingold, Vice Chair	7:00 pm
Joe Caricari	7:00 pm
Sheng Huang	7:00 pm
Bowie Leung	7:00 pm
John Tidball	7:00 pm

Shawna Houser, Secretary-Treasurer
Greg Whitfield, Supervisor, Committee of Adjustment
Erin O'Sullivan, Development Technician

Regrets

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

None

3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: September 10th, 2025

THAT the minutes of Meeting 19, of the City of Markham Committee of Adjustment, held November 26th, 2025, be:

- a) Approved December 10th, 2025.

Moved by: Arun Prasad
Seconded by: John Tidball

Carried

4. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL: NONE

5. PREVIOUS BUSINESS:

5.1 A/057/25

**Agent Name: Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.
4611 Highway 7 East, Markham
CON 6 PT LOT 10**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 2024-19, Section 4.9.6(a):

a minimum landscape strip of 0 metres abutting a front lot line, whereas the by-law requires a minimum landscape strip of 3.0 metres abutting a front lot line;

b) By-law 2024-19, Section 4.9.6(b):

a minimum landscape strip of 0.8 metres abutting a (west) interior side lot line, a landscape strip of 1.3 metres abutting a (east) interior side lot line, a landscape strip of 1.4 metres abutting a rear lot line and a landscape strip of 2.8 metres abutting a rear lot line, whereas the by-law requires a minimum landscape strip of 6.0 metres abutting the interior side lot line and rear lot line;

c) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.2.6(c):

a maximum of 18 dead end parking spaces on a parking aisle, whereas the by-law permits a maximum of 6 dead end parking spaces on a parking aisle;

d) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.2.8(b):

a minimum of 6.0 metres drive aisle width, whereas the by-law requires a full width of the drive aisle to project a minimum of 1.2 metres beyond the adjacent parking spaces;

e) By-law 2024-19, Section 7.2.1.2(f)(i):

a minimum (west) interior side yard setback of 0.89 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum interior side yard setback of 3.0 metres;

f) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.2.5(a):

a minimum width of 2.6 metres for parallel EV parking space, whereas the by-law requires a minimum width of 2.75 metres for parallel EV parking spaces;

g) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.7.1:

a minimum of five (5) Level 2 electric vehicle charging ready parking spaces and three (3) Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations, whereas the by-law requires a minimum of five (5) Level 2 electric vehicle ready parking space and five (5) Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations; and

h) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.2.4:

parking spaces to be obstructed by a loading space, whereas the by-law requires parking spaces to be unobstructed and available for parking purposes;

as it related to renovations to a motor vehicle sales establishment facility with a surface parking area.

The agent, Patrick Pearson, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee accepted the applicant's evidence.

Member Tidball motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: John Tidball

Seconded by: Arun Prasad

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application A/057/25 be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

5.2 A/120/25

**Agent Name: Malone Given Parsons Ltd.
10506 Warden Avenue, Markham
CON 4 PT LT 24**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 177-96, as amended, to permit the following:

- a) **By-law 177-96, Amending By-law 2024-135, Section 7.743.2(h)(i):**
a maximum of 258 dwelling units, whereas the by-law permits a maximum of 160 dwelling units;
- b) **By-law 177-96, Amending By-law 2024-135, Section 7.743.2 (n)(ii):**
a minimum of 0.15 parking spaces per unit for visitor parking, whereas the by-law requires a minimum of 0.25 spaces per unit for visitor parking;
- c) **By-law 177-96, Table B7, CC):**
a minimum landscaped open space of 20 percent, whereas the by-law requires a minimum landscaped open space of 25 percent; and
- d) **By-law 177-96, Amending By-law 2024-135, Section 7.743.2(c)(i):**
a minimum front yard setback of 3.6 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 4.5 metres;

as it related to Block 38 of Draft Plan 19TM-22021.

This application was related to SPC 24 197537 000 00 which was under review concurrently.

The agent, Angela Fang, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee received one written piece of correspondence.

The Committee members concurred that the application met the four tests of the *Planning Act*.

Member Tidball motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: John Tidball

Seconded by: Arun Prasad

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application A/120/25 be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

5.3 A/084/25

**Agent Name: Aleksandar Markovic
76 Highland Park Boulevard, Thornhill
PLAN 2446 LOT 153**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2.1:

~~a minimum west side yard setback of 1.84 metres and a minimum combined interior side yard setback on both sides of 3.68 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.8 metres and a minimum combined interior side yard setback on both sides of 4.0 metres; REMOVED~~

b) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.2.1b):

a maximum roof projection of 2.54 metres above the maximum outside wall height, whereas the by-law permits a roof structure with a pitch of less than 25 degrees to project a maximum of 1 metre above the maximum outside wall height;

c) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2.c:

a maximum main building coverage of 21.4 percent for any storey above the first, whereas the by-law permits a maximum main building coverage of 20 percent for any storey above the first;

as it related to a proposed two-storey residential dwelling.

The agent, Aleks Markovic, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Prasad agreed with the recommendations of the staff report, noted that the applicant had brought forward the reductions requested by the Committee and motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: Arun Prasad
Seconded by: Sheng Huang

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application **A/138/24** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

5.4 A/130/25

**Agent Name: Sensus Design and Build (Jesse Sahlani)
10 Rouge River Circle, Markham
PLAN 6230 LOT 25**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

- a) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2 (E):**
a maximum distance for the first storey of the main building from the established building line of 38.4 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum distance of 19.5 metres for the first storey of the main building from the established building line;
- b) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2 (E):**
a maximum distance for the second storey of the main building from the established building line of 29.90 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum distance of 14.5 metres for the second storey from the established building line;
- c) By-law 2024-19, Section 5.3.3(c)(ii)(i):**
a maximum arc portion width for a circular driveway of 6 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum of 3.7 metres;
- d) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(c)(xiv):**
a maximum main building coverage of 1229.55 square metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum main building coverage of 500 square metres;
- e) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2 (J):**
a maximum outside wall height of 8.9 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum outside wall height of 7 metres; and
- f) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.2.1(b):**

a maximum flat roof projection over the maximum outside wall height of 4.64 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum flat roof projection over the maximum outside wall height of 1 metre;

as it related to a proposed two-storey residential dwelling.

The agent, Oriana Naoa, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Chair outlined that the subdivision comprised estate lots with lower density, deeper setbacks, and mature trees, and that the existing homes were significantly larger than in a standard subdivision, all of which needed to be considered to understand the neighbourhood's context. Previous zoning provisions for the subdivision allowed larger homes. They stated that, given the setbacks, it would provide appropriate spacing from the adjacent lots and the street, and that the requested variances were appropriate for the area.

Member Huang expressed that additional consideration should be given to protecting the trees during driveway construction.

Chair Reingold commented that urban forestry had reviewed the application and that the approval would include tree protection conditions.

Member Tidball expressed concerns regarding the proposed coverage and acknowledged that the Committee needed to consider the neighbourhood's context, but questioned how the Committee would justify that the request met the intent of the by-law.

The Chair indicated that the proposal appeared proportionately appropriate to the subdivision and noted that staff had assessed that the development was appropriate within the context of the neighbourhood.

Member Prasad motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: Arun Prasad
Seconded by: Bowie Leung
Opposed: Sheng Huang
Absent: Joe Caricari

The majority of the Committee approved the application.

THAT Application A/130/25 be approved subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6. NEW BUSINESS:

6.1 A/155/25

**Agent Name: Macaulay Shiomi Howson
770 Markland Street, Markham
CON 3 PT LOT 21 PLAN RP 65R33373 PTS 1 2 AND 3**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 177-96, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 177-96, Table B7 Part 4 of 4 MJC Zone GGG:

a minimum width of landscaping adjacent to the interior and rear lot lines of 0.0 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum width of landscaping adjacent to the interior and rear lot lines of 3 metres;

as it related to an auto service and sales building.

This application was related to Consent application B/031/24 which has been approved.

The agent, Nick Pileggi, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Prasad indicated that the request was technical, related to the severance of the land, and noted that landscaping would be provided.

Member Caricari clarified the ownership of the land, the status of the site plan and agreement, and confirmed the various parcels would be developed through concurrent planning approvals.

Member Caricari motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Joe Caricari
Seconded by: Arun Prasad**

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application **A/155/25** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6.2 A/141/25

**Agent Name: Szeto Architect (Mr. Alfred Szeto)
455 Cochrane Drive, Markham
PLAN 65M2073 LT 5 & PT LOT 4 65R8531 PT 2**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 2024-19, Section 9.4.4.1e (1):

a fitness centre, recreational, whereas the by-law only permits a fitness centre, recreational in the first floor of an office building;

as it related to a unit within an existing business park.

The agent, Alfred Szeto, appeared on behalf of the application.

Member Tidball indicated the request was technical as there were provisions in the By-law for a fitness center and the variance related only to the location within a specific unit.

Member Tidball motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: John Tidball

Seconded by: Bowie Leung

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application **A/106/25** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6.3 A/137/25

Agent Name: 1000879147 Ontario Corp. (Sahar Koosha)
13 Eberly Woods Drive, Markham
65M4709 LOT 2

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 177-96, Section 6.6.2 and 6.6.3:

the as-built uncovered paver landing and stairs to encroach a maximum of 0.85 meters into the required interior side yard setback, whereas the by-law does not permit stairs to encroach into an interior side yard setback;

as it related to an existing side entrance for a residential dwelling.

The agent, Masha Semeshar, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee expressed that the request was appropriate and would not create any safety issues or adverse impacts for the neighbours.

Member Caricari motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: Joe Caricari

Seconded by: John Tidball

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application **A/137/25** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6.4 A/127/25

**Agent Name: Chun Wa Kei
58 Russell Hill Road, Markham
PLAN 65M3364 LOT 212**

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

a) By-law 2024-19, Section 4.8.3 b) iv):

the floor of the rear deck to be higher than the first storey of the main building, whereas the by-law requires a deck floor over 1 metre from grade to not be located higher than the first storey of the main building;

as it related to a proposed rear deck for an existing residential dwelling.

The agent, Chun Wa Kei, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee received two written pieces of correspondence.

Man Fung Young, a neighbour, had concerns regarding privacy, security, and the proximity to the rear lot line.

The Chair commented that the considerations need to be given to the neighbours.

The Chair acknowledged that the neighbour's concerns should be taken into consideration by the Committee.

Member Huang indicated concerns with the proximity of the proposed deck to adjacent properties.

Member Caricari indicated that it was common for families to desire access to outdoor amenity space from the main living spaces of a dwelling.

The Chair concurred with Member Caricari, indicating that the request was acceptable and appropriate development of the lot.

Member Prasad motioned for approval with conditions.

**Moved by: Arun Prasad
Seconded by: Joe Caricari
Opposed: Sheng Huang, Bowie Leung**

The majority of the Committee approved the application.

THAT Application **A/127/25** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6.5 A/142/25

Agent Name: Ajtdesign.ca (Andy Trotter)
40 John Dexter Place, Markham
PLAN 8330 LOT 123

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

- a) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(c):**
a maximum main building coverage of 22.82 percent for the second storey, whereas the by-law permits a maximum main building coverage of 20 percent for any storey above the first; and
- b) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(i):**
a minimum west interior side yard setback of 1.37 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum interior side yard setback of 2.59 metres;

as it related to a proposed second-storey addition to an existing two-storey residential dwelling.

The agent, Andrew Trotter, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee indicated that the requests recognized an existing condition and that the proposal was a reasonable and appropriate development consistent with other dwellings in the neighbourhood.

Member Tidball motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: John Tidball
Seconded by: Arun Prasad

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application **A/142/25** be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

6.6 A/133/25

Agent Name: Gregory Design Group (Shane Gregory)
35 Peter Street, Markham
PLAN 1105 LOT 35

The applicant was requesting relief from the requirements of By-law 2024-19, as amended, to permit the following:

- a) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(D):**
a maximum lot coverage of 36.8 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum of lot coverage of 35 percent;
- b) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(C):**
a maximum second storey main building coverage of 21.4 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum second storey main building coverage of 20 percent;
- c) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(E):**
a maximum first storey distance from the established building line of 19.8 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum first storey distance from the established building line of 19.5 metres;
- d) By-law 2024-19, Section 6.3.2.2(E):**
a maximum second storey distance from the established building line of 16.96 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum second storey distance from the established building line of 14.5 metres;
- e) By-law 2024-19, 6.3.2.2(l):**
a minimum combined side yard of 4.73 metres, whereas the by-law requires a minimum combined side yard of 5.03 metres; and
- f) By-law 2024-19, Section 4.8.10.2(d)(iv):**
stairs used to access a porch to project a maximum of 0.6 metres beyond the porch encroachment, whereas the by-law permits stairs used to access a porch to project a maximum of 0.45 metres beyond the porch encroachment;

as it related to a proposed two-storey residential dwelling.

The agent, Shane Gregory, appeared on behalf of the application.

The Committee received two written pieces of correspondence.

Eric Wheeler, a neighbour, appreciated the design of the proposed house, but expressed concerns that the multiple variances would create a precedent within the Heritage Area and disagreed that the applicant had provided compelling evidence for the necessity of the variances.

Member Caricari expressed that the minor variances that would take the dwelling out of conformity would result in a better streetscape design and noted that the proposal would improve the side yard setbacks. Member Caricari indicated that the requests were minor.

Chair Reingold observed that in many new subdivisions, uniformity was the norm; however, on properties such as those in Heritage Areas, a careful design, as presented, created a unique yet compatible and complementary dwelling that required only minor deviations from the by-law. The Chair also acknowledged that the applicant had received approval from Heritage Markham, which agreed with the proposal's compatibility.

Member Caricari motioned for approval with conditions.

Moved by: Joe Caricari
Seconded by: Bowie Leung

The Committee unanimously approved the application.

THAT Application A/133/25 be **approved** subject to conditions contained in the staff report.

Resolution Carried

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by: Arun Prasad
Seconded by: Bowie Leung

THAT the virtual meeting of the Committee of Adjustment was adjourned at 8:50 pm, and the next regular meeting would be held on January 21, 2026.

CARRIED



Secretary-Treasurer
Committee of Adjustment



Chair
Committee of Adjustment