

## Addendum 1 to Comments

July 9, 2025

Committee of Adjustment

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

1)

**B25-03, A/074/2025, A/075/2025**

1349 Clearview Drive

PLAN 432 PT LOT 7 RP 20R7709 PART 9

*Proposed*

**Under Section 53 and Section 45(1) of the *Planning Act***

**Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL3-0, Residential**

An application has been made for Consent to permit a New Lot. The application is asking to convey the severed lands (Part 2) from Part Lot 7 Plan 432 RP 20R7709 Part 9.

The application is asking to convey a portion of land (Part 2) which is approximately 655.38 m<sup>2</sup> in area with an approximate frontage of 13.185 m on Clearview Drive to be severed from 1349 Clearview Drive for the purpose of creating a new lot.

The retained parcel (Part 1) is approximately 655.95 m<sup>2</sup> in area, with an approximate frontage of 13.185 m on Clearview Drive.

The purpose of this application is to create two (2) single-detached residential dwelling lots. This application is being considered with related **Minor Variance A/074/2025 (Retained)** and **Minor Variance A/075/2025 (Severed)**.

**A/074/2025 (Retained)**

1. To reduce the minimum lot frontage to 13.185 metres

**A/075/2025 (Severed)**

1. To reduce the minimum lot frontage to 13.185 metres.

### **Comments from:**

#### **Letters of Support (1)**

Eric [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Oakville, Ontario, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Secretary-Treasurer  
Town of Oakville  
1225 Trafalgar Road  
Oakville, Ontario, L6H0H3  
coarequests@oakville.ca  
(905) 845-6601 ext. 1829

July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**Subject: Proposed Severance of 1349 Clearview Drive**

Dear Members of the Committee of Adjustment:

We welcome and wish to support the redevelopment of the 1349 Clearview Drive property contributing not only to the increased market value of our properties but also to the continued pleasure of living in the Clearview neighbourhood. All issues raised here should be seen in that context.

In order to assess the impact of the proposed lot severance and minor adjustments under consideration, it is important to understand the intentions of the Applicant:

1. Does the Applicant intend to build the homes as described in the application?
2. Does the Applicant intend to sell the severed lots to one or more unnamed future owners? These owners may have their own house construction plans that may be radically different from those described by the Applicant.
3. Can any commitments or representations as described by the Applicant as to brick finish, garage sizes and locations, elevations, square footage, and depth of homes be considered as intended or as only one of many possibilities under consideration?
4. What commitments made now during this approval process are binding post-severance?
5. Can the committee make the severance approval subject to specific commitments to elevations per drawings, to reduced depth of houses, to side elevations, to tree removals, possible reduction of proposed 3,500 square foot size of homes, to brick facade and garages?
6. What is the timeline of the development plan? i.e. milestones such as, tree removal and knockdown of the existing home, shovel in the ground, foundation completion, complete enclosure, substantial completion of homes?
7. How long will the neighbourhood have to deal with the dust, noise, traffic, and general disruption to the enjoyment of their properties of the intended development?

Specific Issues:

1. Massive 3,500 square foot proposed homes on narrower lots than any neighbors will result in unusually deep houses relative to existing homes. While the lots are deep enough to accommodate these excessively long, narrow homes, the enjoyment of the backyards by the existing homes on either side will be impacted by dramatic side elevations extending well past existing homes and subject to only a four-foot setback from the property line. Can the 3,500 square foot size be reconsidered by the applicant? Possibly reduce to 3,200 square foot size consistent with most homes in the neighborhood. To the extent there is any projection beyond existing homes, can the design of side elevations be reconsidered to break up the visual effect of long walls?
2. Current elevations provided by the applicant show garages will bookend the main entrance and living room windows of [REDACTED] Clearview Drive. My wife and I relax daily on our front deck outside of our living room windows. The Applicant is proposing a very intrusive garage [REDACTED] Can the Applicant commit to reverse elevations so that bookending of existing homes by new protruding garages does not occur? The result will be better continuity and less jaggedness in front elevations from house to house over the four properties. Also, running the new garages side by side will address the strange cut-out of the driveway of the new home beside [REDACTED] Clearview Drive at the potential loss of the centre maple tree (P3 arborist reference) along the Clearview Drive sidewalk. The strange cut-out was designed presumably to avoid damaging the roots of the large maple tree (P2 arborist reference).
3. Grading and drainage issues: There is an existing catch basin at the back of 1345 Clearview Drive, that was built to address the flooding of 1349 Clearview Drive from grading problems arising after the house construction in the second subdivision phase 35 years ago. Need to ensure a reassessment of the adequacy of grading and drainage including the catch basin in light of two proposed, huge new homes as well as changes by various owners over the past 35 years in the grading of all properties in the area. Think swales being filled in, etc. Given increased stress on area drainage, should Oakville consider a need for clean out of the catch basin and underground pipes between the homes at 1345 and 1349 houses?

The bigger drainage issue is the stress on existing drainage and sewage infrastructure of the proposed addition of two new 3,500 square foot homes. Has Oakville made a preliminary assessment of its local infrastructure needs?

4. Enormous loss of mature trees without any planned replacements. I believe this is not consistent with Oakville's policy of planting three trees for every private tree removed. What is Oakville's policy on the removal of so many mature trees? What is proposed in this instance?

I kindly request that the council take these points into account when reviewing the proposed severance. I am available for further discussion and would appreciate the opportunity to discuss during our meeting at 7pm on Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup> of 2025.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Eric [REDACTED]