

Addendum 2 to Comments

November 15th, 2022

Committee of Adjustment

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

1)

CAV A/182/2022

CON 4 SDS PT LOT 26

2006 Water's Edge Drive

Proposed

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

Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL2-0

1. To permit the maximum *residential floor area ratio* for the *detached dwelling* to be 43.81% (461.77 m²).
2. To permit the maximum *lot coverage* to be 31.20% (328.81 m²) for the *detached dwelling* which is greater than 7.0 metres in *height*.

Comments from:

Emails/Letters of Opposition – 3

From:

Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2022 2:28 PM

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

Cc:

Subject: File number CAV A/182/2022, Committee of Adjustment Application by Inderpreet Bindra for 2006 Water's Edge Drive, (Nov 15th)

To: Heather McCrae, Secretary Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

From: Karen Puhlmann
2010 Water's Edge Drive
Oakville, ON
L6L1A4

Regarding: File number CAV A/182/2022, Committee of Adjustment Application by Inderpreet Bindra for 2006 Water's Edge Drive.

Please note that I would also like to participate in the electronic hearing and wish to be notified of the decision for this application.

Dear Committee members,

I am writing to express my comments and concerns regarding the above noted minor variance application for 2006 Water's Edge Drive, scheduled to be heard Tuesday, November 15th. My home is next door to the west of the applicant. I offer the following comments and concerns for committee consideration:

- My family will have a substantial **loss of privacy** from the proposed expansion as the proposed addition has a number of larger and closer windows to my property and will look directly into my swimming pool and back yard. My specific concern is the expansion

of the second floor on the south and south west side. My husband has lived in this house for 50 years and I have lived here for 25 with no privacy concerns. This renovation will change this. As a parent of two teenage daughters, that is a substantial concern. I cannot build a 2 story fence to allow for privacy and don't have enough space available to plant trees that would grow large enough to block this view into my back yard.

- There will be a **substantial shading** to our property and house through the blocking in of the west side of the house to the front and back (see picture below). 2 years ago, the same house was substantially renovated and an addition was added to the second story over the garage. It already blocks a lot of sunlight on our property and this addition will worsen this as well as shade a larger portion of the house.
- There will be a massive white stucco wall to look at to the east of my property where only trees previously existed. It will be ugly. We planted some cedars to try to block the existing white stucco wall, but they may die with the addition as it will block their sunlight. Drawings also show 2 windows proposed on this side. The current window is a staircase and set back so privacy is not as large of a concern. The two new proposed windows will be facing my daughters bedroom and bathroom and will be about 4 ft from our property line.
- The **proposed big white box design** isn't consistent with other properties in the neighbourhood. What is being proposed is too large for the property and it will look oversized and terrible along a key section of roadway which is part of the waterfront trail.
- Allowing for a variance of increasing the maximum residential floor area and maximum lot coverage opens up this street/area to **more opportunistic "monster home" development** seen in other neighbouring municipalities which, over time, can reduce the **affordability** of the neighbourhood for existing residents through property tax increases. Many residents on the street have more modest homes and are long term residents.
- Despite claiming to want to develop the site for his family, as the owner noted when discussing this application with us for the first time on November 10th, he has properties his family renovates and then rents out in Brampton (basements etc). The unspecified structures in the yard and build out of the property, could indicate this is a future party house and/or include a number of tenants on-site. This is not appropriate for our community.
- I am also concerned with the amount of **hardscaping and loss of permeable area for water infiltration** from the proposed addition. If approved, I trust the Town will review closely to ensure the property has a sufficient grading and stormwater plan to ensure there are no impacts on my property.

Thank you for your consideration.
Karen Puhlmann and Sanjay Patel.



November 13, 2022

To: Heather McCrae, Secretary Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

From: Allan Prits, 2005 Water's Edge Dr., Oakville, ON L6L 1A3

Regarding: File number CAV A/182/2022, Committee of Adjustment Application by Inderpreet Bindra for 2006 Water's Edge Drive.

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to request that the committee not approve this supposed "minor variance" application for 2006 Water's Edge Drive, scheduled to be heard Tuesday, November 15th. Our home at 2005 is immediately across the road to the north from the applicant. I offer the following comments and concerns for the committee.

The home at 2006 Water's Edge was just rebuilt by its last owner. This last reconstruction took place 2019 through 2021 and already increased the building height and overall footprint. It was completely "modernized" within the constraints established by the official plan and zoning bylaws. The previous owner never lived in the home...he turned out to be a speculator, despite what he told neighbours after purchase and when starting the renovation. The upper storey of the rebuilt home was expanded, but to fit into the existing streetscape, it was set back from the foundation footprint expansion in several ways during planning to minimize the perception of increase to the overall size of the home. The current owner and applicant Mr. Bindra purchased the home fall 2021 and moved in December 2021, and now seeks to expand the home further by both expanding the foot print and foundation, and expanding the second storey out to the full extent of his latest footprint expansion.

Our family will have a substantial loss of natural light and view as the proposed addition will remove the setbacks and upper storey offsets, further reducing the view of the sky and now eliminating any existing lakeviews from our home. Our family has lived in our home for 25 years. We have always enjoyed the south facing light and view of the lake, which will be blocked if this proposed variance is approved and carried out. Loss of existing lakeviews is a significant impact to our home and property.

The proposed "big white Coleman Cooler" box design isn't consistent with other properties in the neighbourhood. What is being proposed is too large a mass for the property and lot size, and will diminish the understated and set back homes that currently exist along this section of the street.

The as yet undefined gazebo and wet bar proposed for the rear yard in this application is for close to 470 ft² (45 m²), and **seems more like a potential rental suite than a pool side amenity area**. These unknown details matter.

The math on the proposed floor area increases can't be followed, and likely understates the actual increase in floorspace associated with this variance request as the current second storey roof has a large supported overhang to the east allowing view through the structure to the lake, this large architectural opening is proposed to close if this variance is approved and constructed. This is compounded as the current drawings supporting this application do not identify the licensed professional responsible for their preparation (BCIN, architect, engineer, etc), the documentation and any math should be considered suspect until this oversight is addressed and calculations clarified. The supposed drawings and the information presented should be considered cartoons until an appropriate licensed professional is identified with ownership.

In closing, I suggest the following four (4) points summarize why this request for variance should not be approved:

- 1) The official plan for low density residential in this neighbourhood does not support the kind of massing and street front presence that this "big white box" Coleman Cooler like dwelling proposed for this variance will present.
- 2) The zoning bylaws set constraints for reasonable property coverage that this proposed variance request far exceed....it is suspected that the current calculations may even understate the true expected exceedance resulting from the addition that is proposed, those details require clarification. This is further compounded by the proposed poolside suite. The current zoning bylaws do not support this type of dwelling and development on this property.
- 3) As the size and scale of this development will have a significant negative impact on the streetscape and individual neighbouring properties, it is not desirable.
- 4) The sheer magnitude of the massing and projected numerical exceedance of the allowable dwelling size mean this request for variance is not minor in nature.

I reached out to introduce myself to Mr. Bindra in spring 2022 when we were both outside in our front yards after he had moved in. I welcomed him and his family to our neighbourhood, we exchanged pleasantries several times in the months that followed. I was initially disappointed upon opening notification of this variance request as Mr. Bindra didn't reach out to discuss his plans in advance, I assumed we had a collegial, neighbourly relationship. The cartoons dated July 28, 2022 were contemplated and prepared months before the notice was sent. Upon reflection, since this proposed increase in dwelling will eliminate our home's lakeviews, shade our home, and dramatically alter the streetscape, I guess I can see why I wasn't contacted by Mr. Bindra.

Thank you for the committee's consideration of my input.

Please note that I would also like to participate in the electronic hearing and wish to be notified of the decision for this application.

Allan Prits

From:

Sent: Monday, November 14, 2022 9:37 AM

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

Subject: File No.: CAV A/182/2022

Heather McCrae
Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment
1225 Trafalgar Road,
Oakville ON L6H0H3

Details are as follows:

Name: Farouk Kazim

Address: 10 Third Line, Oakville, ON L6L3Z4

Application Number: CAV A/182/2022 (2006 Water's Edge Drive)

Please note that I wish to pre-register as a delegation for the above captioned hearing on Tuesday November 15th 2022 at 7:00 pm.

In addition, I wish to be informed of the decision.

Regarding File No.: CAV A/182/2022, the following are our comments:

1. For just over 46 years we have lived in the property that is south of 2006 Water's Edge Drive, with which we share a common boundary.
2. We do not believe that the variance requested in the application can in any way be classified or referred to as "minor".
3. The present residential FAR is more than generous at 37%. Any increase in this ratio would result in a dwelling that would have a magnitude and scale which appear larger than the dwellings in the surrounding neighbourhood. We estimate that if the increase in FAR is granted, the resulting FAR will be approximately three times our FAR, which is next door!
4. Any increase in the maximum lot coverage (25%) would not allow adequate open space for outdoor amenity areas and, in particular, for storm water infiltration. In addition, it would not be in concordance with the rules and regulations governing the surrounding single-family dwellings in the neighbourhood.
5. The construction of a swimming pool so close to the boundary will have implications for drainage and grading, given the landscape of the land. Our land is sloping towards the lake, and we have had numerous issues with previous owners when the water from their pool had emptied onto our land, causing flooding in our basement. This has happened on several occasions when their pool was drained onto Third Line just before winter. It should be noted that the water table is quite high in Oakville.
6. The character of the houses in the immediate vicinity is that of single-family dwellings, with due consideration to the FAR and lot coverage specifications. We would like to maintain this profile and not be inundated with larger-than-life developments which transgress the existing norms of our neighbourhood.
7. In summary, we do not support this request for a variance adjustment for the aforementioned reasons.

Thank you,

Farouk Kazim