

Addendum 6 to Comments

May 04, 2021

Committee of Adjustment

BY VIDEO-CONFERENCE AND LIVE-STREAMING ON TOWN WEBSITE **OAKVILLE.CA**

1) CAV A/063/2021

PLAN 1 BLK 78 LOTS 1,2
176 FRONT ST

Proposed

Under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*

Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL3 SP:11

1. To permit two attached *private* garages.
2. To permit a vehicle entrance facing the *front lot line* of 5.24 m (westerly garage) and 1.72 m (easterly garage).
3. To permit a *minimum front yard* of 5.24 m (westerly addition) and 1.43 (easterly reconstruction).

Comments from:

Email/Letter of Objections

Re: May 04, 2021 Committee of Adjustment Application hearing for 174-176 Front Street

In our opinion, the request for variance to permit two attached private garages whereas the bylaw allows a maximum of one attached private garage per dwelling is NOT minor. It is **too large** and **too important** to be considered minor.

(a) This is an **important** property with heritage designation as part of the Old Oakville Heritage District. The form and character of this proposal consisting of two garages with hard stone material flanking either side of the heritage house erodes the esthetics of the streetscape and is not consistent with the heritage guidelines contained in Old Oakville Heritage District Plan, which suggests that additions should be sympathetic to the District's character and for a smooth transition, particularly given the significance of this important home.

(b) We disagree with the proposed two garages. Two garages on a property which is already positioned right at the street is **too large**, and presents a potential hazard for this heavily traveled pedestrian roadway with no sidewalks.

We have noticed other driveways close to this home where vehicles overhang onto the public right-of-way. In our opinion, a new garage and driveway on the west side of the home is too close to the entrance/exit path frequented by hundreds of visitors to the park and area that has high pedestrian circulation along Front Street. There is no pedestrian or traffic study completed, to our knowledge, that would provide data to acknowledge and understand the degree of risk to pedestrians. Therefore, only one garage on the east side should be allowed to reduce the number of conflict points with pedestrians and reduce the amount of paved surface and parking in the front yard of this important heritage house.

The proposed changes to the property are not consistent with the planning principles outlined in the Heritage District Plan. Given this, we think the application does not maintain the general intent and purpose of the official plan. The proposed development is incompatible with the established built form and character of the neighbourhood and it erodes the esthetics of the streetscape.

Respectfully submitted

Andrew & Carol Kennedy

32 Thomas Street, Oakville