

## **Addendum 1 to Comments**

June 25, 2025

Committee of Adjustment

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

**A/081/2025**

2341 Canonridge Circle  
PLAN M833 LOT 182

*Proposed*

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

**Zoning By-law 2014-014 requirements – RL6, Residential**

- 1.** To reduce the minimum length of the parking spaces not located in a private garage to 5.5 metres.

**Comments from:**

**Letter(s)/Email in Opposition – 15**

## coarequests

---

**From:** STEVE ROWLAND [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 12:30 PM  
**To:** coarequests; Allan Elgar  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concerns and Questions Regarding Variance Request for 2341 Canonridge Circle

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom It May Concern,

We have received your letter regarding the property at **2341 Canonridge Circle** and the request for a **variance to adjust the driveway to accommodate an attached additional residential unit (ARU)** within the existing dwelling.

Could you please forward the link for the **videoconference scheduled for June 25th at 7:00 p.m.**, so we may attend and listen to the proceedings?

While I understand the videoconference is not the appropriate forum for expressing formal objections, I would appreciate some clarification on what this specific variance entails. In addition, I would like to take this opportunity to raise several important questions and concerns related to the proposed development.

### Questions Regarding Construction and Design:

1. **Walkway Location:** Will the walkway to the apartment be located on the **north or south side** of the house?
2. **Air Conditioner Placement:** If the walkway is planned for the south side, will the air conditioner—which currently protrudes into that area—be **relocated**?
3. **Construction Timeline:**
  - o When is construction expected to **begin**?
  - o How long will it **take**?
4. **Impact on Existing Structures:** Will construction require the **removal of the fence**?
5. **Driveway and Parking Adjustments:**
  - o How will the planned changes **affect the façade** of the house?
  - o How does this alteration **increase parking capacity**, as suggested by the submitted plans?
  - o The current drawings appear to reflect **only three parking spots**. Will the garage space continue to function as a garage, or is there an intention to convert it into living space?

### Concerns Regarding Approval of a Basement Apartment:

I would like to express my **strong opposition** to the introduction of an additional residential dwelling on Canonridge Circle, and I want to outline several serious concerns, many of which are shared by other members of the community:

- **Parking Pressure:** Parking is already extremely limited in front of this property. With frequent visitors, the area is often congested. This is further complicated by the presence of a **community mailbox** and proximity to a **four-way stop**, which already sees significant traffic. Parked cars often **obstruct sightlines**, making it difficult and potentially hazardous to reverse out of driveways or see children, seniors, or pedestrians.
- **Comparative Issues:** A nearby home on Gooseberry Way with a basement apartment routinely experiences **parking overflow**, despite having more available street space than 2341 Canonridge Circle.
- **Property Damage and Safety:** Street parkers often use our driveway to execute three-point turns. Our vehicle was previously **hit**, and we have since had to install security cameras to monitor the area.
- **By-law Complaints:** Several neighbors who use street parking responsibly have faced **by-law complaints** from others, further highlighting the existing tension in the area.
- **Neighborhood Integrity:** Canonridge Circle is a quiet, family-oriented street comprised of **single-family homes**. Residents, including ourselves, moved here for its **peaceful and private character**. Increased density introduces **more pollution and noise, less privacy, and potential decline in property value**. Will the town be **reassessing property taxes**, given that basement apartments may negatively impact home values?

### Concerns Regarding the Property Owner:

- The **current owner has leased the property for over five years**, and previous tenants have posed significant challenges: neglecting lawn maintenance, failing to clear snow, leaving garbage and recycling bins out for days, and allowing trash to blow freely across yards. I've previously submitted complaints (including photos) to the Town regarding these issues.
- There was also an incident involving the **air conditioner making excessive noise**, which was only resolved after repeated intervention by by-law officers.
- More seriously, there is strong reason to believe the basement was previously used for **short-term rentals or Airbnb**, with **large groups arriving and departing at all hours**. If this reflects the owner's approach to tenant selection, I am deeply concerned about future renters' impact on our community.

### Clarification Requested:

- How many units is the owner intending to rent within the basement apartment?
- Will it be rented as a **single unit or individual rooms**?
- Is there an **intention to repurpose the garage** as living space?

---

I appreciate the opportunity to raise these concerns and questions. I want to emphasize that the **entire community shares deep reservations** about the approval of this or any similar additional residential units in our area. I respectfully request that these concerns be considered seriously during the review of this variance application and permit approval.

Sincerely,

Stephen Rowland and Andriana Bursac  
 [REDACTED] Canonridge Circle, Oakville, ON L6M 4T9  
 [REDACTED]

## coarequests

---

**From:** Fansheng Meng [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 2:50 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Cc:** Allan Elgar; Peter Longo  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection to Minor Variance Application – File # A/081/2025 (2341 Canonridge Circle)

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Secretary-Treasurer,

I am a resident of [REDACTED] **Canonridge Circle**, writing to express my objection to **Minor Variance Application File # A/081/2025**, regarding the proposed reduction in driveway length at 2341 Canonridge Circle.

Although this may seem like a small change, I am concerned that it may be related to the construction of an Additional Residential Unit (ARU), which could lead to more parking issues, increased density, and changes to the quiet, single-family nature of our neighborhood.

There has been little information shared with residents, and many of us feel we have not had enough time or details to provide proper feedback. I respectfully ask the Committee to **delay the hearing** and provide more transparency before making a decision.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Fansheng Meng  
[REDACTED] Canonridge Circle  
Oakville, ON L6M 4T9

## coarequests

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:17 AM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection to Variance at 2341 Cannonridge Circle

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To: Jen Ulcar  
Subject: Objection to Minor Variance Application - File #A/081/2025  
(2341 Cannonridge Circle)

Dear Secretary-Treasurer,  
I am writing as a concerned neighbour to formally oppose the minor variance application for 2341 Cannonridge Circle (File #A/081/2025), which is scheduled for hearing on June 25, 2025.

I reside at [REDACTED] Calloway Drive, Oakville, Ontario, L6M 4V1, and my property directly backs onto 2341 Cannonridge, sharing a portion of the fence line.

While I understand the Town of Oakville's goals for increasing housing flexibility, I have serious concerns about the impact this variance and construction of a basement apartment will have on the surrounding neighbourhood, particularly on my home and those of my immediate neighbours.

### Key Concerns:

#### 1. Loss of Privacy for Pool Owners



I have a backyard swimming pool that borders this property, and another neighboring home with a pool is also affected. The addition of a secondary unit, along with increased occupancy, traffic, and sightlines, would significantly reduce the privacy that we currently enjoy and rely on during the summer months.

## 2. Construction Impact and Risk of Damage

The construction required to add a separate entrance and finish the basement unit will be extensive, with potential for dust, debris, and physical disruption that could affect the pool area, filtration systems, and the safety of outdoor use. Our properties are in close proximity and were not designed for this level of construction activity.

## 3. History of Airbnb-Like Use and Unusual Traffic

There is already a history of transient occupancy at this address, with frequent visitors coming and going at all hours, consistent with short-term rentals such as Airbnb. Adding an official secondary unit could encourage further transient rental activity, degrading the stability and safety of our residential community.

## 4. Poor Maintenance Record

The property has historically been poorly maintained: the lawn often goes uncut, leaves remain unraked for extended periods, and garbage and debris are commonly left around the exterior. Adding a tenant unit would only exacerbate these conditions unless there is stronger enforcement.

## 5. Drainage and Flooding Risks

Our rear yards have experienced significant flooding in the past two summers due to heavy rainfall and the natural slope of the land toward our homes. Excavation and construction of a basement entrance could worsen the water runoff situation and cause water damage or erosion, both during and after construction.

## 6. Zoning and Neighborhood Character

This is a quiet, low-density single-family residential neighborhood. Allowing multi-unit living is not in keeping with the original intent of the zoning (RL6) and would undermine the character of the area. The approval of this variance may set a precedent that could lead to further unwanted intensification.

## 7. Rooming House and Parking Concerns

I am also concerned that the basement apartment could ultimately be divided informally into a rooming house-style setup, which would result in multiple unrelated occupants and an even greater impact on the neighborhood. This type of usage often leads to increased noise, safety issues, and wear on infrastructure. Furthermore, the number of cars associated with this unit may exceed what is currently listed on the plans, placing further strain on already limited street parking.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee of Adjustment deny the variance application. The proposed changes will have a negative and lasting impact on the immediate neighbors and the overall integrity of the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and for considering the perspectives of affected residents. Could you please add me to the virtual meeting as I would like to attend . Please send me the PIN code to access the meeting.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Bays

██████████ Calloway Drive, Oakville, Ontario, L6M 4V1

## coarequests

---

**From:** Tazeem Hasan ██████████  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:44 AM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 2341 Canonridge Circle variance application

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from ██████████ [Learn why this is important](#)

We heavily object to any variances or modifications as a neighbour in the same area. Please let us not make the city any more difficult to live. Oakville today is busy and also has become crime prone exactly opposite of what we want. Why too many unknown influx of people. We don't the neighborhood to have vehicles parked all over ; traffic pressure, increased density ; why do we need more basements ? What are we trying to achieve to improve standard of living here by adding a possible rental space. ? This application is not befitting for the neighborhood. Maintenance of outside space of 2341 Canonridge is already not up to the mark. Sincerely. Muhammad Hasan. ██████████ Canonridge Cir, Oakville, ON L6M 4T9. ██████████ We remain



## coarequests

---

**From:** Ajay Lal [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:52 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] File# A/081/2025 - 2341 Canonridge Circle, Oakville

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon,

My name is Ajay Lal and I am the original owner and resident of [REDACTED] Canonridge Circle, Oakville.

I understand that the owners of house # 2341 Canonridge Circle, Oakville, that is only a few houses away from mine have applied for a zoning variance to allow for an additional residential unit as well as changes to the property's parking configuration.

I am in complete opposition to this proposal for several reasons. The reasons for my opposition are, but not limited to, the following:

- Increased density
- Inconsistent with neighbourhood character
- Traffic and parking issues on a street that already lacks sufficient parking
- Future precedent
- Lack of genuine hardship shown in application.

In the year 2002 I stood overnight in a line up at Mattamy Homes to purchase my home as it was extremely desirable due to the location, neighbourhood design and unique exclusivity environment. I do not want that to be compromised in any way.

All the residents on our street are in opposition of the application and I sincerely hope it will be denied.

Thanks and respectfully submitted

Ajay Lal

Sent from my iPhone

**Subject: Group Objection – File # A/081/2025 – 2341 Canonridge Circle**  
**To: Jen Ulcar, Secretary –Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment – Town of Oakville**  
**Cc: Allan Elgar and Peter Longo, Councillors of Ward 4 – Town of Oakville**

**Dear Members of the Committee,**

We, the undersigned residents living in close proximity to 2341 Canonridge Circle, wish to express our collective objection to the Minor Variance application (File # A/081/2025), which seeks a reduction in the minimum required driveway length.

While described as a “minor” change, we are deeply concerned that this variance appears directly tied to the proposed construction of an Additional Residential Unit (ARU), as stated in the public notice. As such, the implications of this application extend well beyond physical measurements and raise serious concerns about increased parking demand, residential density, safety, and distinct neighborhood character.

**Our key objections include, but are not limited to:**

- **Parking and Traffic Safety:** Reducing the driveway length—especially if the garage is repurposed as living space—will diminish on-site parking availability. This could inevitably push more vehicles onto the street, increasing congestion and posing safety risks, particularly for children, seniors, and other pedestrians in our family-oriented community.
- **Residential Density and Community Impact:** Adding an ARU with unclear occupancy plans may lead to increased resident numbers per household. This disrupts the original low-density, single-family design and character of the neighborhood and could establish an undesirable precedent for future intensification of land use on streets not designed to accommodate it.
- **Lack of Transparency and Public Engagement:** To date, neither the applicant nor the Town has provided detailed information regarding the proposed project. In accordance with the *Access to Information Act* of Canada, we formally request full public disclosure of the construction's scope, intended use, parking strategy, occupancy expectations, and construction timeline. Without this information, residents cannot provide informed input, and the decision-making process lacks necessary public accountability.

- **Property History and Quality of Life:** This property was previously used as a long-term rental, during which time there were visible concerns such as garbage buildup and exterior neglect. Given that history, many residents are understandably worried that potentially even more occupants in the multiple rental units can exacerbate similar issues and negatively affect the cherished quality of life and the well being of the families in our distinct neighborhood.

Given these shared concerns, we respectfully urge the Committee to **reject** this application. At a minimum, we request that the hearing be **deferred** until all relevant project details are publicly shared and affected residents have a meaningful opportunity and sufficient time to review, consult with appropriate professionals and then respond.

We thank you for your attention and for supporting a transparent, responsible, and community-informed review process.

**Sincerely,**

*Attached is the List of 28 Undersigned Residents*



## Group Objection – Signature Page

We, the undersigned residents, support the attached objection letter regarding File # A/081/2025 – 2341 Canonridge Circle.

Name	Address	Signature
Jianfeng Ju	████████ Canonridge	Ju Jianfeng
Andriana Bursac	████████ Canonridge Cir	Andriana Bursac
Alexander Krouglov	████████ Canonridge	Alexander Krouglov
Chungfang Liu	████████ Canonridge	Chungfang Liu
DWIGHT FRANCIS	████████ CANONRIDGE CIR	D. Francis
RUPERT AMBLER	████████ CANONRIDGE CIR.	Rupert Ambler
SOMIKA ALORA	████████ Canonridge circle	Somika Alora
Ajay Lal	████████ Canonridge Circle	Ajay Lal
Steve Rowland	████████ CANONRIDGE CIR	Steve Rowland
AMIR TEHRANI	████████ Canonridge Cir	Amir Tehran
RITU HURIA	████████ Canonridge Cir	Ritu Huria
John Vezina	████████ Canonridge Cir	John Vezina
LORRAINE CHAN	████████ CANONRIDGE	Lorraine Chan
JENNIFER WILLIAMS	████████ Canonridge Cir	Jennifer Williams
FANSHENG MENG	████████ Canonridge Cir	Fansheng Meng
Giovanni Lavallo	████████ Gooseberry Way	Giovanni Lavallo
Wael Elnadi	████████ Gooseberry Way	Wael Elnadi
F. CERANTOLA	████████ Gooseberry Way	F. Cerantola
LORRI ECKERT	████████ Gooseberry Way	Lorri Eckert
Marko & Anita Manic	████████ Gooseberry Way	Marko & Anita Manic

## Group Objection – Signature Page

We, the undersigned residents, support the attached objection letter regarding File # A/081/2025 – 2341 Canonridge Circle.

[illegible]



## coarequests

---

**From:** Christopher Megally [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:39 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 2341 Canonridge Circle Zoning Variance OBJECTION

**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

As a resident of Canonridge Circle, I object to the following variance request.

This is due to inconsistency with Neighbourhood character. The proposed variance departs from madame's original neighbourhood design approved by the town in the early 2000s. Reducing the driveway length and removing a garage parking stall set a lasting precedent that risks eroding our communities design integrity.

Additionally, this will increase density meaning more people, more cars, more noise which is concerning for privacy and noise in the neighbourhood which is significantly different from our quiet single-family residential character

Thank you

Chris Megally  
**Realtor | Sales Specialist**  
[REDACTED]

---

Sorry my information

Chris Megally, resident of [REDACTED] Canonridge Cir, Oakville, ON L6M 4T9

File #A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle

Chris Megally  
**Realtor | Sales Specialist**  
[REDACTED]

## coarequests

---

**From:** Mani Arora [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 10:46 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection to Construction @ 2341 Canonridge circle, Oakville, L6M4T9  
  
**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi

I am Mani Arora. I am owner and resident of [REDACTED] Canonridge circle , Oakville , L6M4T9

I received a letter from the Town of Oakville in proposed regards to a construction and additional of multiple dwelling/rental units at 2341 Canonridge circle

I strongly object to this construction

***Thank You, Mani Arora***

[REDACTED]

**From:** Jianfeng Lu [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 9:54 AM  
**To:** Oakville Revenue Services & Tax <tax@oakville.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concern Regarding Variance Application (File # A/081/2025), at 2341 Canonridge Circle and Potential Property Value Impacts

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Oakville Taxation Department,

I am writing as a homeowner on Canonridge Circle in Oakville to express concerns regarding **File # A/081/2025**, a Minor Variance application currently under review for 2341 Canonridge Circle (L6M 4T9).

A recent public notice from the Town of Oakville refers to a proposed reduction in minimum driveway length, which appears to be associated with the construction of an Additional Residential Unit (ARU). While full project details have not yet been disclosed, many in the neighborhood are concerned that such modifications may alter the long-standing single-family residential character of the street and potentially lead to increased rental activity and residential density.

Given these concerns, we believe there is a credible risk of decreased property values for nearby homes—particularly if these changes lead to reduced neighborhood desirability, parking congestion, or stability.

We respectfully request that The Town's taxation department closely monitor this case and ensure that any future property assessments reflect the changing dynamics and any adverse impacts on surrounding homeowners. Should neighborhood character or market value be negatively affected, we trust that fair and responsive adjustments will be considered.

Thank you for your attention and your continued efforts to uphold transparency and equity in assessment practices.

Sincerely,

**Jian Feng Lu**

[REDACTED] Canonridge Circle  
Oakville, ON L6M 4T9

Dated: June 21, 2025

**Committee of Adjustment Attn: Jen Alcar**  
Town of Oakville  
coarequests@oakville.ca

**Re: Objection to Minor Variance Application – Property: 2341 Canonridge Circle**  
**File #A/081/2025**

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to formally object to the application for a minor variance submitted on the above mentioned property.

While I understand the need for increasing housing options, this particular request raises several concerns regarding the character, livability, and functionality of our neighbourhood. In my opinion, the proposed variance is **not minor in nature**, nor is it **appropriate or desirable for the area**. My objections are based on the following key points:

1. **Neighbourhood Character:** The introduction of an attached ARU in this context may set a precedent for denser forms of housing inconsistent with the current low-density, single-family residential zoning. This alters the intended planning vision for the neighbourhood, that Mattamy planned over 20 years ago, and may negatively impact property values.
2. **Parking and Traffic Impact:** The addition of another unit will increase the number of vehicles requiring parking. Most homes on our street have limited driveway capacity, and increased on-street parking will reduce visibility, obstruct emergency vehicle access, and create congestion. There are many small children on this street and I am concerned for their safety.
3. **Privacy and Noise:** Adding another household to an existing structure can introduce additional noise, reduce privacy for adjacent properties, and result in more frequent comings and goings that are not compatible with the quiet, family-oriented character of our area.
4. **Cumulative Impact:** Although this variance may be considered minor in isolation, its approval could contribute to a cumulative effect that alters the zoning framework and planning intent for the area over time. The long-term consequences should be carefully weighed before any decision is made.

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that the Committee **deny the requested variance** and encourage the applicant to explore options that comply fully with the existing zoning by-law.

Thank you for considering my objections. I would appreciate being notified of any future public hearings or decisions related to this matter.

Sincerely,  
**Halina and Tony Lipinski**  
[REDACTED] Canonridge Circle  
Oakville, ON L6M4T9  
[REDACTED]

Original resident of Canonridge Circle, since 2003.



Dear Members of the Committee,

I, the undersigned resident living in close proximity to 2341 Canonridge Circle, wish to express my objection to the Minor Variance application (File # A/081/2025), which seeks a reduction in the minimum required driveway length.

While described as a "minor" change, I am deeply concerned that this variance appears directly tied to the proposed construction of an Additional Residential Unit (ARU), as stated in the public notice. As such, the implications of this application extend well beyond physical measurements and raise serious concerns about increased parking demand, residential density, safety, and distinct neighborhood character.

Our key objections include, but are not limited to:

- **Parking and Traffic Safety:** Reducing the driveway length-especially if the garage is repurposed as living space-will diminish on-site parking availability. This could inevitably push more vehicles onto the street, increasing congestion and posing safety risks, particularly for children, seniors, and other pedestrians in our family-oriented community.
- **Residential Density and Community Impact:** Adding an ARU with unclear occupancy plans may lead to increased resident numbers per household. This disrupts the original low-density, single-family design and character of the neighborhood and could establish an undesirable precedent for future intensification of land use on streets not designed to accommodate it.
- **Lack of Transparency and Public Engagement:** To date, neither the applicant nor the Town has provided detailed information regarding the proposed project. In accordance with the Access to Information Act of Canada, we formally request full public disclosure of the construction's scope, intended use, parking strategy, occupancy expectations, and construction timeline. Without this information, residents cannot provide informed input, and the decision-making process lacks necessary public accountability.
- **Property History and Quality of Life:** This property was previously used as a long-term rental, during which time there were visible concerns such as garbage buildup and exterior neglect. Given that history, many residents are understandably worried that potentially even more occupants in the multiple rental units can exacerbate similar issues and negatively affect the cherished quality of life and the well being of the families in our distinct neighborhood.

Given these shared concerns, we respectfully urge the Committee to reject this application. At a minimum, we request that the hearing be deferred until all relevant project details are publicly shared and affected residents have a meaningful opportunity and sufficient time to review, consult with appropriate professionals and then respond. We thank you for your attention and for supporting a transparent, responsible, and community-informed review process.

Sincerely,  
Jieping Xu, [REDACTED] Canonridge Cir.





Anita Khanna  
[REDACTED] Canonridge Circle  
Oakville, ON L6M 4T9

June 23, 20025

**Committee of Adjustment**

Town of Oakville  
1225 Trafalgar Road  
Oakville, ON L6H 0H3

**Subject: Opposition to Minor Variance Application A/081/2025 – 2341 Canonridge Circle**

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to Minor Variance Application A/081/2025 for 2341 Canonridge Circle, which seeks relief from Zoning By-law 2014-014 to reduce the required minimum length of parking spaces and to allow for the construction of an attached additional residential unit (ARU) within the existing dwelling.

As a homeowner residing at [REDACTED] Canonridge Circle, I am deeply concerned that this proposal undermines the intent and integrity of the Low Density Residential designation in this neighbourhood. While staff have concluded that the variance is minor in nature and that the reduced parking space length remains functional, the implications of this application extend well beyond technical measurements. The variance introduces broader impacts on neighbourhood character, resident experience, and long-term planning consistency:

**1. Departure from Neighbourhood Design and Planning Intent**

Canonridge Circle was designed and built as a community of single-family homes, and this form is clearly reflected in the RL6 zoning and the Town's Official Plan. Permitting an additional residential unit in this context represents a clear deviation from the established and approved planning framework for our area. The assertion that the proposed change is "minor" fails to consider the cumulative precedent it may set.

**2. Increased Traffic and Congestion**

The addition of a second residential unit inherently brings increased vehicular activity. Despite the Planning Department's view that a reduction from 5.7 metres to 5.5 metres in parking space length is acceptable, the introduction of another household—complete with its own vehicle(s), visitors, and service needs—will

create increased parking pressure on a narrow, quiet residential street not designed for higher-density usage.

**3. Impact on Privacy and Noise**

An additional residential unit typically introduces more occupants, daily comings and goings, and general activity that alters the lived experience of adjacent homeowners. This increase in density will diminish the privacy and quiet enjoyment that residents expect and value in this established community.

**4. Undermining Zoning Integrity and Precedent Setting**

Granting this variance opens the door to future applications that may further erode the single-family character of this neighbourhood. If this application is approved, it becomes difficult to reject similar requests, fundamentally altering the landscape of the area and the nature of Oakville's low-density communities.

**5. Lack of Community Support**

My neighbours and I have a desire to preserve the original intent of the neighbourhood's design and resist ad hoc densification.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Committee to deny Minor Variance Application A/081/2025. While I understand the need for greater housing diversity in Oakville, such efforts must be pursued through appropriate channels and community consultation, not by incrementally undermining established planning designations through exceptions.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I ask that this letter be added to the public record in opposition to this application.

Sincerely,

*Anita Khanna*

Anita Khanna

Homeowner, [REDACTED] Canonridge Circle

## coarequests

---

**From:** Greg Chadwick [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:11 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Objection to proposed rezoning re:file#A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle Oakville  
  
**Categories:** JEN

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Subject: Objection to Application for Construction of an Additional Residential Unit in a Single-Family Neighborhood

Dear Secretary-Treasurer

I hope this letter finds you well.

I am writing to formally object to the application A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle Oakville that seeks approval for the construction of an additional residential unit within the property located at 2341 Canonridge Circle Oakville.

This application proposes to alter the current single-family home in a way that would introduce an additional residential "rental" unit, thereby increasing density in what is traditionally a single-family housing neighborhood. This new proposed "rental" unit would increase this small number of homes to a total of now 3 "rental units" on one very small single family home neighborhood creating something that the majority of the homeowners did not imagine when investing here.

While I understand the need for increasing housing supply, I believe that this specific proposal is not in the best interest of our neighborhood for the following reasons:

**1 Impact on Neighborhood Character** Our community has long been a residential area characterized by single-family homes, which is a defining feature that contributes to the overall appeal and cohesion of the neighborhood. Introducing an additional basement "rental" unit within an existing home will lead to a change in the aesthetic and social dynamics, which will diminish the quality of life for existing residents and decrease property values immensely.

**2 Increased Traffic and Parking Concerns** Allowing an additional basement rental unit in this area will lead to increased traffic, congestion, and parking demand, which is already a concern in our neighborhood due to the small road ways. Single-family homes typically have limited driveway and street parking, and the introduction of an additional unit would exacerbate these issues, making it more difficult for residents to park or navigate the streets safely.

**3 Overcrowding a Single Family residential neighborhood.** The existing infrastructure in our neighborhood was designed and sold for single families, not 2 to 3 families. By accepting the continuous applications for building separate basement rental units in this one neighborhood, the town of Oakville is basically rezoning us to an apartment inclusionary area, something that future buyers looking for single family neighborhoods to purchase into will not find appealing. Adding one more rental unit will place unnecessary future financial burden on the existing home owners who choose to sell in the future. When

do “Renters” take precedent over existing home owners who have invested in the appeal and aesthetics of the their neighborhood?

**4 Precedent for Future Developments** Finally, approving this application could set a precedent for similar projects in the area, leading to further densification in an already established single-family zone. These “rental” units have already led to an erosion of the neighborhood's character, and if more properties are modified to accommodate additional basement “rental” units, this will ultimately change the fabric of our community that was not foreseen when we as property owners purchased (not rented) our properties.

In light of these concerns, I respectfully urge you to reconsider approving this application. I believe it is essential to maintain the integrity of our neighborhood by preserving the current zoning and land-use designations that support single-family homes. I would be happy to discuss my concerns further and look forward to your consideration of this matter.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely, Greg Chadwick

████████ Canonridge Circle Oakville



## coarequests

---

**From:** Nadia Colantonio [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 11:55 PM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Concern re: proposed zoning variance in our neighbourhood (File # A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle)

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

Dear Secretary-Treasurer,

It recently came to my attention that there is a proposed zoning variance at 2341 Cannonridge Circle to allow construction of an attached additional residential unit as well as changes to the property's parking configuration. My husband and I are the original owners of our home; just a few homes away from the home requesting the variance.

I have concerns if this variance is approved as this will alter our neighbourhood character. We have lived at our home at [REDACTED] Gooseberry Way for 22 years. We have raised our family here and have much pride in our ownership. We have invested time, effort and resources in its maintenance, improvements and curb appeal.

We currently have neighbours who are renters. One family rents the main living space. Two couples are renting the basement unit. Although they have always been polite and respectful, there is often parking pressure on a street that has limited street parking. Multiple vehicles are parked on the small driveway overpassing the length of the driveway and therefore jutting into the street. For a brief time last year cars were even parked on the lawn, until someone made a formal complaint to the city about this.

Because the property is not owned by either tenant, there is no responsibility for upkeep of the exterior grounds and we are often picking up trash that blows over onto our property.

We do not want to move away, however modifying Mattamy's original neighbourhood design which was approved by the Town in the early 2000's risks eroding our community's design integrity and opens the door for more multi-unit conversions in our neighbourhood. These changes will drive existing homeowners away and change this quiet, peaceful, beautiful neighbourhood we have lived in and loved to call home for so many years.

We are very concerned about losing our privacy due to the increased density. We are also very concerned about the increased noise levels and safety hazards due to the increased density on such a small street/circle.

This neighbourhood was not designed for high density living. Your consideration in this matter is highly appreciated as this proposal causes much concern to my family as well as most families on this small block in NorthWest Oakville.

Kind regards,

Nadia Colantonio & Anthony Morielli  
[REDACTED] Gooseberry Way, Oakville, L6M4T8  
File # A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle



## coarequests

---

**From:** Sheri Riddoch [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 7:28 AM  
**To:** coarequests  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] File #A/081/2025 2341 Canonridge Circle

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

Good Day,

I am writing to you concerning the notice posted at 2341 Canonridge Circle to allow construction of an attached additional residential unit. I would like to express our objections pertaining to this request as outlined below:

- 1) Parking - our street is constantly lined with cars making it difficult for everyone to navigate at all hours of the day and is a danger to our children as traffic laws are often unadhered to, I have personally seen cars pass school buses when the stop signs have been out on more than one occasion and this is the tip of the iceberg. Also with more cars and traffic comes noise.
- 2) There are numerous new constructs that have recently built in our area with a variety of options for all types of families to help alleviate the need for housing. Modifying current single family homes are going to set a precedent that will destroy the character and charm of current neighbourhoods which is why many of us chose to live in Oakville in the first place.
- 3) Population density - additional residential units in single family dwellings is going to cause further strain on our community that is already struggling to keep up with the overpopulation in our area, if we continue through this path we will be turning into an apartment rental complex and that is not how our residential area was zoned. This will decrease our property value and change the community dynamic which we have taken pride in and worked hard to upkeep for over 15 years.
- 4) Crime - has overwhelmingly increased over the last few years in what was once a very safe and quiet neighbourhood, adding more people increases the opportunities for crime and with rental properties tenants churn which puts our neighbourhood at even greater risk than it already is. We have break-ins, car theft, property vandalized - we have taken precautions to up our security systems along with adding numerous cameras for our community safety.

The charm of the City of Oakville is quickly eroding along with the integrity of our neighbourhood that is supposed to be supporting single family homes which encourage a sense of community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and would be happy to discuss these concerns at any time.

Sincerely,

Sheri Riddoch  
[REDACTED] Canonridge Circle  
Oakville  
[REDACTED]