2)A/105/2023 15 Forster Park Drive PLAN 776 LOT 25

Proposed

Under Section 45(1) of the Planning Act

Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements - RL4, Residential

1. To increase the maximum height to 9.9 metres.

Comments From:

Letters of Support (7):

Letter of Opposition (1):



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

hilson latric Signature Name:

Address:

Forster Park Drive

Date: _____May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

Name: hosa Wechici.

_____Signature: R Vecchia

A	hh	ro	00
m	uu	IU	95

Forster Park Drive

Date: 12, May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

Valler Sonia McClelland Name: Signature: 6 Forster Park Drive Address:

Date: 12 May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

Produsignature: Name:

Address _____ H

_ Forster Park Drive

Date: 12 May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

Name: Signature:

Address

Forster Park Drive

Date: 12 May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

Name: Licia Monact rese

Signature

Address

Glenmanor Drive, Oakville

Date: 12th May 2025



Date: May 9th, 2025

Committee of Adjustment City of Oakville

Attn: Secretary-Treasurer

RE: 15 Forster Park, Oakville, ON L6K 1Y5

I/We have reviewed the site plan and exterior elevations of the proposed residential building for increasing the height from 9m to 9.9m. which follow the regulations of new home construction of Ontario and reduce costs over time.

I/We support the variance which will be requested at the Committee of Adjustment Hearing.

1-6 Name: MARK POPLORSKI Signature: Queen Mary Drive, Oakville Address

Date: 12 May 2025

May 12, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

We oppose the minor variance application submitted in connection with 15 Forster Park Drive, Oakville

(the "Subject Property"). In doing so, we concur with the conclusions of the planning services staff and our neighbors located at Forster Park Drive that the Subject Property's proposal does not maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan.

In addition to the points raised by others, we respectfully note our objection to the Subject Property's calculation of floor area ratio ("FAR") as not in strict compliance with the text and intent of Zoning By-law 2014-014. The definition of Floor Area, Residential "means the aggregate area of a residential building containing a dwelling measured from the exterior of the outside walls, but shall not include a private garage, basement, or attic unless otherwise specified in this By-law." Notably, the text of the By-law is silent with respect to permissible deductions relating to open to below ("OTB") space in structural plans.

The Subject Property plan takes the liberty of deducting 31.45 square meters of OTB space, likely relying on guiding text in the margin of the definition mentioned above: "Foyers and cathedral ceilings are no longer counted twice in calculating residential floor area." We believe that the proposed deduction is improper, and we cite the very next margin comment to support our position, "stairs, elevators and exterior walls are counted at each floor level."

Our position is that the calculation of the floor area ratio of the Subject Property plan should be consistent with the text of the guidance regarding stairs, elevators and exterior walls. Our suggested approach is most in keeping with the text of the By-law and with the scope and intent of the Official Plan for one simple reason: Visually and practically, it matters not whether interior space is separated by a floor. The scale and mass of the deducted areas in the Subject Matter plan would have both the same exterior appearance and the same negative impact on surrounding properties whether or not the interior space is partitioned by a floor. Using our proposed methodology, the correct FAR for the Subject Property Plan would be 41.8%, which exceeds the permitted FAR by a significant margin. In sum, we believe that a By-law amendment should be considered to resolve the textual inconsistency in the definition of Floor Area, Residential and the conflicting guidance related thereto.

To conclude, we respectfully request that the Subject Property's application for a minor variance be denied.

Thank you for your consideration.

Your truly,