

Addendum 1 to Comments

December 13th, 2022

Committee of Adjustment

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

1)

CAV A/203/2022

PLAN 1005 LOT 4

142 Wolfdale Avenue

Proposed

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

Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL1-0

1. To permit the maximum *residential floor area ratio* for the *detached dwelling* to be 32.82% (491.18 m²).
2. To permit a *balcony* above the floor level of the *first storey*.

Comments from:

Email/Letter of Opposition – 1

From:

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 10:28 AM

To: Heather McCrae <heather.mccrae@oakville.ca>

Subject: Re 142 Wolfdale Ave, CAV A/203/2022

Good day, forwarding the attached email as provided to the agent previously.....

Firstly, regarding the floor variance area, It appears to us from the site plan drawing that the area envisaged results in the roof soffit violating the northern setback requirement and some of the south. We believe that setbacks should not be violated by any part of the house, and slightly reducing the width of the building would result in permitted ratios being achieved.

Secondly, and most importantly, I strongly object to the proposed second story balcony. These balconies are prohibited for a reason- mainly to prevent overlook and protect neighbour privacy. Regardless of the size or intended usage, the existence of the balcony (and what appear to be quite large facing windows) creates a privacy concern for all backyards in visible range- particularly the neighbour to the south, whose backyard pool will now be overlooked from a close proximity.

In summary, we do not consider the variances to be either necessary, or minor in nature and are not supportive.

Sincerely, Janet and Richard Van Nest
Owner, 114 Wolfdale Ave.

Dear Mr Barrett

Thank you for reaching out to outline the proposal and invite comments- We wish all neighbours undertaking construction followed such an approach to address concerns and minimize neighbourhood angst.

Firstly, regarding the floor variance area, It appears to us from the site plan drawing that the area envisaged results in the roof soffit violating the northern setback requirement and some of the south. We believe that setbacks should not be violated by any part of the house, and slightly reducing the width of the building would result in permitted ratios being achieved.

Secondly, and most importantly, I strongly object to the proposed second story balcony. These balconies are prohibited for a reason- mainly to prevent overlook and protect neighbour privacy. Regardless of the size or intended usage, the existence of the balcony (and what appear to be quite large facing windows) creates a privacy concern for all backyards in visible range- particularly the neighbour to the south, whose backyard pool will now be overlooked from a close proximity.

In summary, we do not consider the variances to be either necessary, or minor in nature and are not supportive.

*Sincerely, Janet and Richard Van Nest
Owner, 114 Wolfdale Ave.*