

## **Addendum to Comments**

November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Committee of Adjustment

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

1)

**CAV A/198/2022**

**304 SUMNER AVE**

PLAN 1 BLK 90 LOT 3 PT LOT 4

*Proposed*

### **Under Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act* Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL4-0**

1. To permit a *minimum* (westerly) *interior side yard* of 0.62 m.
2. To permit a *minimum rear yard* of 1.26 m.
3. To permit the maximum *residential floor area ratio* for the *detached dwelling* to be 48.08% (329.00 m<sup>2</sup>).
4. To permit the maximum *lot coverage* to be 38.59% (264.06 m<sup>2</sup>) for the *detached dwelling* which is greater than 7.0 metres in *height*.

### **Comments from:**

#### **-1 Letter of Objection:**

Dear Members of the Committee of Adjustment,

We are the owners of 168 Reynolds St. The western side of our property borders the eastern side of 304 Sumner Ave.

We have received notice of a proposed minor variance application made by our Sumner neighbours. We have reviewed the related plans, including for a proposed 2-storey addition, siding our property to the east.

The proposal would increase coverage and gross floor area for the property by over 10%. In the circumstances, we submit that this enlargement is not justified or reasonable.

Based on the submitted plans, it appears that the majority of the 2-storey addition (approximately 400 ft.<sup>2</sup>) will run along the east side of the existing 304 Sumner building. The submitted materials do not address the impact to the east, which is of prime importance to us and to the enjoyment of our property and private space.

Generally speaking, we do not object to the tasteful renovation of heritage properties in our neighbourhood. The proposals appear to be mindful of overall neighbourhood considerations. However, increasing the coverage and density in the neighborhood beyond the Town's established limits does raise issues from our perspective. Except in exceptional circumstances, we think that the Town's coverage and density requirements should be adhered to and respected.

In this particular case, the proposed addition will move the existing building footprint as much as 8 feet towards our shared lot line, so that the proposed building will sit at the minimum setback distance and rise up 2 stories - compared to the existing one story structure.

Our concern is that the enlargement of the 304 Sumner footprint will close-in our property, limiting sunlight from the west and also adversely impacting our general sense of space and privacy.

In our view, granting discretionary relief should only be done in circumstances where the impact on adjacent properties is minimized. We do not think that is this case.

Earlier today we discussed our concern with our neighbour, Bill Haines. He explained the reasoning behind the addition and enlarged footprint. While his development rationale is understandable, we believe that the impact of enlarging the 304 Sumner footprint is not reasonable given the impact it would have on our property. We are hoping that there is a way to revisit the plans to minimize the east-side impact.

We will attend the Tuesday meeting and will be happy to address any questions that the Committee may have regarding our objection.

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard through this process.

Yours truly,

Susan and Stephen Ashbourne

---

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP  
199 Bay Street, Suite 4000, Toronto ON M5L 1A9 ()