

Addendum 1 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

Date: May 3, 2021

Re: May 04, 2021 Committee of Adjustment Application Hearing
File No.: CAV A/063/2021
176 Front Street
Plan 1 BLK 78, Lots 1 & 2
Application for Variance #1

We are writing to express our opposition to the request for variance for the above noted property to permit two attached private garages as we do not feel that it meets the four tests that you consider in any variance application.

No.	Zoning By-law Regulation	Variance Request
1	Section 5.8.1 d) A maximum of one attached private garage per dwelling shall be permitted	To permit two attached private garages

It is our understanding that the rationale for the bylaw allowing only one garage is as follows:

- The intent of limiting the number of garages per dwelling is to reduce the number of conflict points with pedestrians and reduce the amount of paved surface and parking in the front yard

From the pictures below which were taken by us on Monday, May 3rd at 9:00 a.m. – you can see that the proposed location of the new garage and driveway on the western side of the property has significant potential for conflict points with pedestrians and cars. It is right beside the entrance to Lakeside Park and very close diagonally across to Thomas Street.

Front Street is a very historic and important street in Oakville's history – its narrow with the three houses on the southside very closely set up against the road, it is one way headed east; it has no sidewalks and for decades has been a well travelled and enjoyed pedestrian walkway that connects the Town of Oakville's Lakeside Park with Dingle Park further to the east. The Old Oakville Heritage District Plan in its Block Analysis notes that "Front Street is very narrow and intimate here" and suggests that this area is an integral part of a walkway system that traverses along the lake shore in the Old Oakville area.

The house at 176 Front Street was built shortly after 1837 and sits right up at the edge of the street. The Old Oakville Heritage District Plan identifies it as a large two storey house displaying the characteristic plan and profile of Georgian houses of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It was built

by James McDonald, a carpenter from Scotland and is deemed as representative of the period in that it combines the earlier Georgian plan with contemporary classical revival detail. For decades, there has been an attached 3 bay garage on the east side further away from the entrance to Lakeside Park and given the history of proximity to the street, there has been vehicle overhang in that eastern location.

Pictures Taken Monday, May 3rd at 9:00 a.m.

Picture #1 – Taken from Northeast corner of Thomas and Front Street looking towards 176 Front



Picture #2 – Same taken from Northeast corner of Thomas and Front Street looking towards 176 Front (standing back a bit further) – showing Thomas Street intersection and attached garage on the east side of the house.

Note: Front Street is a one way street heading east and as such all traffic coming from Thomas Street are required to turn left on to Front Street



Picture #3 – Taken from inside Lakeside Park looking east– corner of Thomas Street and Front Street. You can see the narrowness of Front Street as described in the Old Oakville Heritage District Plan; the pedestrian pathway from Front Street into the park and the picket fence which sits on the western property line shared by Lakeside Park and 176 Front Street



Based upon our review, we don't think that the application for variance #1 to allow for two attached private garages meets the four tests.

1. Is the application minor?

We do not think that the application for variance #1 is minor for two reasons:

- a. The addition of a second new garage on the westerly side of the property (on a property which is positioned right at the street) increases the potential for conflict points with pedestrians and as such is too important an issue to ignore. This is an extremely busy pedestrian corner and we believe that if an appropriate traffic and pedestrian analysis was completed that the data would support our concern
- b. Given the importance of the property and its designation as part of the Old Oakville Heritage District, the form and character of the addition of a garage on the westerly side erodes the aesthetics of the streetscape and is not sympathetic to the District's character

2. Is the application desirable for the appropriate development or use of the land, building or structure?

3. Does the application maintain the general intent and purpose of the official plan?

Given the importance of the property and its designation as part of the Old Oakville Heritage District Plan, we do not think that the form and materials proposed for the new attached garage on the westerly side is desirable or maintains the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan (as outlined in the guidelines for alteration/new construction within the Old Oakville Heritage District Plan) as it is not visually sympathetic with the existing building on the property or the surrounding streetscape.

4. Does the application maintain the general purpose and intent of the zoning by-law?

We do not think that the application to permit two attached private garages maintains the general purpose and intent of the zoning bylaw. From our review, we believe that the bylaw allowing a maximum of one attached private garage per dwelling is particularly appropriate for this property. We believe that the attached garage on the easterly side of the house, while still close to the property line and not ideal remains the most appropriate location for the one attached garage per dwelling that the bylaw envisions. From a planning and public interest perspective, the intention to reduce the number of conflict points with pedestrians is clear and as such, this application for variance should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane Hawkrigg & Jamie Macrae
65 Navy Street