

Addendum 1 to Comments

August 07th, 2024

Committee of Adjustment

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

1)

CAV A/106/2024

485 Rebecca Street

PLAN 622 LOT 1

Proposed

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

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

1. To increase the maximum residential floor area ratio to 39.84%.
2. To increase the maximum lot coverage to 27.28%.

Comments from:

Email of Opposition – 2

From: Gordon Hibrant [REDACTED]
Sent: August 4, 2024 2:56 PM
To: coarequests
Subject: [EXTERNAL] CAV A/106/2024

You don't often get email from gordon_hibrant@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

COA:

I am writing to submit my comments regarding this COA application for 485 Rebecca St.

I live at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] east of the subject property.

In regard to the variances requested, I do agree that they are minor in nature. However, invariably, I see variances in my community requested for virtually every property being redeveloped. As such, it begs the question - what is the point of by-laws with maximums if they are only going to be exceeded each and every time? Without doubt, the designers for the properties know this, know what the tolerances are, and craft their variances accommodating those tolerances. What is wrong with setting by-law maximums intelligently, not to be exceeded, with graduating ratios, and relative to the property itself?

The comments from the COA staff state:

The intent of the Zoning By-law provision for regulating the maximum residential floor area is to ensure a dwelling's mass and scale does not appear larger than the dwellings in the surrounding area.

and:

The intent of the Zoning By-law provision for regulating the maximum permitted lot coverage is to ensure a dwelling's mass and scale does not appear larger than the dwellings in the surrounding area and to mitigate any potential grading and drainage impacts from decreased permeability.

As each variance with increased ratios is approved, these larger ratios become entrenched in the community and, essentially, become the new baseline from which even larger ratios are requested and can be justified since that is what is in the community (according to staff's characterization). This is a dangerous precedent.

In regard to the tree canopy currently on the subject property, ONLY 2 OF THE 22 TREES WILL REMAIN! Is this considered "livable Oakville"? What happened to the enhanced tree protection by-laws crafted to further protect the town's tree canopy? Included in the 20 trees to be removed, is tree 12, a healthy, mature (40+ year old) majestic maple that burns bright red in autumn. It is unconscionable to not protect this tree. Also included are trees 1 through 4, mature, seemingly healthy conifers. Why are these trees not being protected? They have absolutely no impact to the redevelopment. This is a clear cut of unconscionable proportion. Again, this is a dangerous precedent. Finally, tree 8 BELONGS TO 479 REBECCA ST and should not be part of this site plan, please remove it as a numbered tree - I do not want this tree to become an unintended victim of this clear cut. Of course, a tree permit has yet to be issued for this property - let's hope things change.

I look forward to having my concerns addressed. Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to respond to the redevelopment.

Gordon Hibrant
[REDACTED]

From: Malcolm Wootton [REDACTED]
Sent: August 2, 2024 10:33 AM
To: coarequests
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Submission to Committee of Adjustment

[You don't often get email from aandmwootton@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Ref: CAV A/106/2024 (485 Rebecca Street)

My name is Malcolm Wootton and my wife and I have lived at [REDACTED] for the past 54 years. Our property borders the subject property on the Northeast corner and is separated by several cedar and juniper bushes and trees. These vary in height from 20-30 feet and form a natural fence which provides privacy, aesthetic value as well as well established environmental benefits. In addition, we have enjoyed valuable shade for our patio and garden from the ever increasing heat intensity of the sun.

It was with considerable alarm that we noted the Site Plan indicates these cedars and junipers are to be removed.

We respectfully request the Applicant reconsider this removal for the following reasons:

- 1) A well established living fence already exists along with the desired privacy.
- 2) The cedar and junipers would not interfere with the construction of the new house.
- 3) The environmental benefits of the trees are well established.

In addition, we would like to request the large maple tree in the back be retained. It is much admired by us and several other neighbours and as a National symbol it deserves to be preserved.

Respectfully,

Malcolm G. Wootton