

## **Appendix A – Public Comments**

### **Robert Regan**

Do to high residential density in this area and so many seniors in this area we say no way to this development.

### **Gerda Neuhaus**

I have received a letter from the town and I assume a lot of people have received this letter in which we are told that there is a plan to build townhouses on this property. I can see this property from my side windows and for the life of me I can only see that there is already an apt. building on this property. Where are these townhouses going to go. On the roof of the building? There is no land there, there is a driveway into the garage for the people who live there. There are some beautiful old trees there. Maybe somebody had a funny idea to build treehouses. Where do they get those idiotic ideas ? Please advise. Thank you

### **Elizabeth Hanna** – Marine Drive

Proposed Official Plan

I am objecting to these townhouses being built on Marine Drive with patios on top of the roof. The noise from people playing music, or having b.b.q's will be most disturbing. At the moment we are fortunate enough to have peace and quiet, but once these townhouses are built with the open patios, we are doomed.

Please consider this e.mail as an objection.

### **Sam and Margery DiGiandomenico** – Marine Drive

We wish to register our opposition to the proposed amendment to allow construction of the apartment building increasing the density of the neighbourhood.

This area of town and particularly Marine drive is busy enough without adding more residents. As you are aware, there are the Ennisclare Towers, the apartment building on this location, apartment building at the NE corner of East and Marine and another one on the SW corner of the same intersection, the apartment at the corner of Ontario and East Streets. In addition, there is a planned proposed apartment/condo tower at the SE corner of East and Lakeshore. There currently is a senior retirement and assisted living complex next to this site on Lakeshore which backs onto Marine and also adds to the congestion. In addition to these existing and proposed buildings, during the seasonal months, this area is subjected to increased traffic, not only from commuters who are taking the scenic route home, but also from recreational drivers who travel East along Ontario street, up East street and then East on Marine.

This also includes noisy sport cars not to mention the different Harley and their signature "throaty" and extremely noisy sounds. We are also impacted by the many major community events now held at the waterfront park at the foot of East street stretching to Bronte road. More residents adds more cars which impact the safety of residents.

We realize this is a high density neighbourhood, but even "high density" must have a limit. We believe this limit has been reached in this area.

If Council in their wise decisions set the limit for high density, what has changed to warrant an increase? We believe and urge Council to maintain the current bylaw.

This area is not near any major transportation arteries. Any new and high density developments should occur near these arteries like the QEW, 407 and the rail lines. Port Credit is a good example where a few high rises dot the landscape around the GO station.

**Lyndsey Thomas** – Marine Drive

I recently received a letter from the Town advertising an application to amend the official plan and zoning by-laws at the above mentioned property.

Is there going to be an opportunity for the residents in the area to attend a public information meeting regarding the proposed building? I am sure there are a number of people who have concerns about the design of the building not to mention the removal of green space along the street.

I appreciate any insight you can provide.

**Heather Howard** – Marine Drive

This e-mail is my submission to object to this proposed amendment for 2220 Marine Drive.

I live at \_\_\_ Marine Drive, beside 2220 Marine Drive, in the town houses that back onto the front of this property.

I strongly object to the phrase 'vacant portion' of the property that is mentioned in your letter (undated). This land is the front garden for this property. Does this mean that any land that is used for a garden or lawn can be developed?

We overlook this lawn and garden from our deck and enjoy the feeling of space and openness that it creates in this area surrounded by high rise condominiums.

It seems that the owners of this property are solely interested in making the maximum revenue from this property and are not considering the effect that this development will have on the residents, including their own tenants, that will be impacted from this change.

Please ensure that this submission is added to other submissions against this proposal.

**Patricia Johnson** – Marine Drive

I am making a written submission to be notified of any meetings or communications on the proposed official plan amendment and zoning bylaw amendment for 2220 Marine Drive 1213763 Ontario Inc. & 1319399 Ontario Inc. Z.1727.04 and OPA 1727.04 Ward No. 1

Would you please confirm that this request meets the requirements to be included in the decision process and the decision.

**Patricia Johnson** – Marine Drive

This is my appeal of the above proposal. There are a number of items which were discussed at the meeting with the Town and the residents on June 28 with which I am in agreement, including the lack of parking planning for future growth and convenience of the residents of 2220 Marine Drive, the roof top terraces which could add to the noise in the area and interfere with the views from the higher apartments in the surrounding area, and the design of the building which looks very commercial and does not fit in with the aesthetics of the area and the location of the units which are too close to the street. Not to mention the disruption that would be caused to all residents, including the seniors residence across the street, during the construction phase. When I bought my townhouse in 1986 I saw this as an already established older area of Oakville as I am sure many of the residents did. Who would have dreamed that someone would want to place another building on that small patch of green space in front of an already-existing and occupied building?

I realize that a lot of the younger generation think that we of the older generation are against change. I am not against change if it makes things better, but jamming 27 units and people to occupy those units like sardines on that small plot of green space is not better for me or for any of the current residents of the area, as well as for the community which would like to be viewed as the most livable town.

I have lived in Oakville since 1962, raised my children here, supported Oakville with taxes and community involvement, as have many of the other residents in our area. I currently own the townhouse at 2222 Marine Drive which is the first unit to the west of the proposed site where I had hoped to remain until I no longer can stay in my home. This proposal does not only **not** benefit me and my neighbours but it devalues our properties and the living conditions in the area. This proposal only benefits the ones who will profit monetarily. It is surprising and disappointing that this proposal was even made and that the Town would even consider it.

**Lorrain Vanlith** – Marine Drive

My name is Lorraine Vanlith and I live at \_\_\_ Marine Drive. I am unable to attend the meeting on June 28th and I have decided to express my opinion via this email.

Within one block on Marine Drive from Southaven Place to East St. there are eight high rise apartments and approximately 40 townhouse units. Add to that the extra traffic for Bronte harbour and all the other apartments and townhouses in the area that I did not count is that this area has already done its part for high density housing. Plus the pending building at the corner of East St. and Lakeshore.

We have enough.

**Pauline Ponedel** – Marine Drive

I am in receipt of a communication regarding the above proposal which I assume was given to all occupants of \_\_\_ Marine Drive.

It has also come to my attention that the very people first to be impacted by any change in the vicinity of 2220 Marine Drive, were themselves not in receipt of said communication. If this is

correct it simply is not good enough. Their interest should be a priority and information of any developed proposed in their own back yard should be ongoing.

They are also the first to be impacted by the inconvenience of noise, dust loss of light, view and having more traffic to contend with. And they are the ones who should have been respected by the correspondence inviting their input and the opportunity to prepare for the Public Information Meeting at Town Hall scheduled for Wednesday, June 28th, 2017.

That such a building can be built in front of an already existing high rise, with the ensuing addition of more parking in an already overloaded area, is just not feasible. When the existing residents moved into 2220 Marine Drive I am sure they did not expect another building be built so close taking away light, a recreation area and the beautiful view they are paying good rent for.

And as a nearby resident and neighbour to this proposed building I will be impacted by the noise and increased traffic.

The density in this area is already high and it seems to me that the Planners should give more thought to what residents think instead of giving way to developers. But of course the new taxes brought in would come in handy wouldn't they? The right to enjoy peace and quiet comes in a far second.

As well as objecting most vehemently to this proposition I would like Paragraph No. 3 to be clarified as to the increase in density. Does it mean that as well as the four storey apartment building proposed, more of the same can be added in future?

Bronte appears to be the perfect haven for all sorts of development, designed not to be part of the 'livable town' the Mayor suggests. Bronte already has terrible traffic problems. It is hard to find any street in the area not impacted by large vehicles parked anywhere there is space with the drivers engaged in tearing down and rebuilding homes with no cautionary signs that turning vehicles would have problems.

And how would be the building itself be accomplished? The impact of this in the area of Marine Drive, Ontario and East Streets would be horrific.

I would like Planners to take the side of residents once in a while and see the bigger picture from their point of view.

If I am not in attendance at next week's meeting I would like my objection noted that I am not in favour of this proposal and meanwhile be provided with a clearer definition to the very difficult to understand paragraph 3 of your June 12th correspondence.

Copies of this correspondence are going out to area residents which I hope will encourage them to pass their many and varied vocal objections on to you Mr. Thun as well as our local Councillors.

**Louise Daniell** - Marine Drive

I am against this. I live here.

**Edie Misiak** - Marine Drive

I live in \_\_\_ and this is in response to a letter I received which pertains to the proposed Official plan of 2220 Marine Dr.

I certainly object to a building being built in front on an existing building.

**Ken Moffat** - Marine Drive

I am writing with respect to the application by 1213763 Ontario Inc. & 1319399 Ontario Inc. for amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law of the Town of Oakville (Z.1727.04 and OPA 1727.04, Ward 1) relating to a proposed development (the "Proposed Development") at 2220 Marine Drive in the Town of Oakville (the "Subject Property"). I have an interest in this matter because I am an owner of Unit # \_\_\_, a condominium unit in \_\_\_ Marine Drive, the property that is immediately to the east and adjacent to the subject property. The condominium unit that I own is on the west side of \_\_\_ Marine Drive and, accordingly, faces toward the Proposed Development on the Subject Property.

My objection to the Proposed Development relates solely to the planned inclusion of rooftop terraces on the Proposed Development as shown in Architectural Drawings A200-A, A200-A401, A200-402, and A200-A501 found on the website for the Town of Oakville at: <http://www.oakville.ca/assets/2011%20planning/da-172704-architectural.pdf> .

My objection to the inclusion of such terraces arises because there is a high probability that such terraces will be the source of noise produced by activities on these rooftop terraces. The proposed design of the rooftop terraces includes wooden fences that will serve as sound (and visual) barriers between the various residences in the Proposed Development. However, there are no such barriers, nor are any feasible, between the planned rooftop terraces in the Proposed Development and the residences, such as mine, that are above the Proposed Development. The absence of vertical sound barriers and the resulting probability that disruptive and excessive noise will emanate from these terraces is contrary to the criteria of Sub-Sections a) and b) of Section 11.1.9 of *Livable Oakville*, The Official Plan of the Town of Oakville. Specifically, Sub-Section a) requires that the "built form of development...is to be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood." Most of the buildings in the immediate vicinity of the Subject Property are adult life-style communities or seniors' residences. As such, residents in the area have come to enjoy and expect sound levels that are much more moderate than is likely from the terraces of the Proposed Development. Consequently, inclusion of the terraces in the Proposed Development results in a built form that is not compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Similarly, Section 11.1.9 b) of *Livable Oakville* requires that "Development should be compatible with the setbacks, orientation and *separation distances* within the surrounding neighbourhood (*emphasis added*)." I acknowledge that the standard for separation is typically horizontal. However, with respect to sound, vertical separation is relevant. Since the Proposed Development has not, and cannot, provide separation that will be adequate to minimize excessive and disruptive noise that is likely to emanate from the rooftop terraces that are planned for the Proposed Development, such rooftop terraces should be eliminated from the design of the Proposed Development.

As previously indicated, I do not object to the Proposed Development except with respect to the plan to include rooftop terraces on the Proposed Development. I trust that planning officials and councillors of the Town of Oakville will consider this objection and will require the applicant to modify the plan of the Proposed Development by eliminating the planned rooftop terraces.

Please be advised that I wish to be notified of the decision of the Town of Oakville on the proposed official plan and zoning by-law amendment.

**John S. Smith** – Marine Drive

As President of HCC 114 ( \_\_\_ Marine Drive), I am personally appalled to learn of this proposal to add further suites by way of a separate apartment building at the front of the site. It would be a serious blot on the landscape in this area and yet another example of developers trying to persuade Council to adhere to the ridiculous density plans now in place for Bronte.

There is so much more land available in the Town and perhaps you need to look more at East Oakville or are they protected against such planning?

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting but I know we will be represented. I would however like to be kept updated on all activities with regards to the application and when further public meetings are planned.

I sincerely hope Council will put an end to this application as soon as possible.

**Jane & Ken Briggs** - Marine Drive

My name is Jane Briggs. My husband, Ken and I live on the West side of \_\_\_ Marine Drive; which faces the building located at 2220 Marine Drive.

We are most definitely opposed to this zoning by-law amendment, which in essence would allow construction of a multilevel rental building on what is currently a lovely, small, garden parcel of land. Issues pertaining to noise, parking, site-infringements, road safety, and the elimination of the only green space left on Marine Drive are some of the major factors attributing to our position.

This proposed building does nothing to add to the cherished and valued village of Bronte, but it does everything contrary to what we as residents want to see in our community. We are definitely in favor of development. Development that is well thought out, well planned, well designed, in the right location, and adds value to the community. This proposed development is none of these things. It is, quite frankly, absurd and can only be attributed to the bottom line profits of a corporation and a total disregard for the community and residents that call Bronte their home.

We unfortunately can not attend the meeting this evening, Wednesday, June 28, as we have previous commitments that cannot be changed.

Mr. Thun please share our absolute opposition to this development. Any assistance you can provide in having the Town Council reject this proposal will be most greatly appreciated.

I am opposed to the Official Plan and By-Law Amendment to permit development of the vacant portion of the site at 2220 Marine Drive.

## **Linda Brox** - Marine Drive

As a 20 year resident of \_\_\_ Marine Drive, I am very concerned about what appears to be over development in all areas of Oakville. The very fabric of neighbourhood communities is being destroyed. There are already plans to develop the corner of East Street and Lakeshore and East Street and Sovereign.

Bronte and the Marine Drive community have a large population of seniors who enjoy walking through what is still a relatively safe, quiet and green space. This community is still an outdoor one with access to nature. Keep filling up the green spaces and Bronte/Marine Drive will be like a congested Toronto neighbourhood with outside views cut off and less light exposure.

Just east of 2220 Marine Drive are 2 large condo apartment multi-story buildings on both the north and south sides of Marine Drive. On any given day, there is traffic in and out of 2175, 2185 Marine Drive and 2170, 2180 Marine Drive. Added to that are the cars and service vehicles parked along Marine Drive. There is a curve in Marine Drive between 2220 and these buildings on the south side that affects visibility and also safety.

Add to this mix the growing inconsiderate driving habits of some drivers and there is a big safety issue.

Add more people to this proposed new building and you have more traffic congestion and noise and a potential for more crime.

This proposed development will affect the indoor and outdoor parking at 2220 Marine Drive. What effect would construction have on the existing parking garage and the building foundation?

What plans are there to support the infrastructure as more and more buildings and people are added to this area?

I have voiced this before; but I'll say it again. Are we going to have more power outages, traffic jams, accidents, and issues with garbage pickup as Bronte gets re-designed?

How will this development affect the well being of the current residents of 2220 Marine Drive?

Just because there is a space, doesn't mean it should be developed.

## **Bronte BIA**

Unfortunately with the preparations in place for Oakville's Canada Day, which our BIA produces, none of our board members or myself are able to attend this evening, however we do wish to register our support for this expansion of residential units on Marine Drive.

On behalf of the 200 member businesses of the Bronte BIA, we are fully supportive of this expansion. Bronte Village needs more population to survive and thrive and be sustainable.

We have submitted our thoughts on height and density on several previous communications to our Town of Oakville Planning Dept. This expansion of residential fits into this vision.

Bronte BIA is fully supportive of this expansion.

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this at any time with you.

**Steve MacDonald** - Marine Drive

Hi , I was at the meeting on Wednesday concerning the proposed development at 2220 Marine Drive and I have a couple of additional comments to make.

I think that issue of the number of additional assigned parking spaces the building has, over the Town minimum, is between the owners and the tenants. There are approximately 17 visitor spots plus 2 disabled spots available. There are at this moment 6 open spaces, making visitor parking 70% full on Friday, June 30, 2017 at 3:15 PM. Over the next few months I will keep a random log of how many are used on random days and random hours. This will pose no inconvenience to me as I am on the 22nd floor overlooking the subject lands. I will pass this information on to you before the next meeting. I am CC'ing Councilor Ralph as he is our local and I have worked with often over the past 25 years.

What really concerns me is the parking lot land coverage. For instance there was a green space just east of the service entrance and it was torn up and 9 additional assigned parking spaces were added. Green space lost. The only green area left on the property is where the new development is supposed to go. When all is done there will be almost no green space left. The 4 condo towers to the east have no outdoor assigned parking, only visitor outdoor parking. Any new development should have this taken into consideration when granting zoning exemptions. Remember the song, "They paved Paradise and put up a parking lot". We'll keep in touch.

**Heather Howard**

Comment regarding parking space:

As you probably know, there is substantial work being done to the underground garage at 2220 Marine Drive. The work has been going on for about two months, and I don't know when it will end.

Because this work is being done, the contractors have had a very large bin for construction debris in the parking area. As well, a substantial portion of the parking area at the east side of the lot has been cordoned off for construction materials and a port-o-potty. There have been numerous large trucks delivering construction materials as well as the usual moving trucks, care van, emergency vehicles. Looking out there right now, at 4:30 P.M. on a Thursday afternoon, I can't see how the lot could accommodate many more cars as the visitors area is full and a considerable part of the renters spaces are full as well.

Another thing to consider, is given the rent that would be charged for the proposed stacked townhouses, it would probably take two people working to afford the cost. Last night I thought I heard the traffic planner say that renters were assumed to have only one car, which is not true even now. Some couples have two cars and some renters have a second car as a "toy" or special vehicle.



Have a look at the wall along the west side of the property, which I assume is a wall supporting the garage. I can see on our side where the wall is deteriorating, but there hasn't been anyone around looking at this wall that I've seen.

As this is a forty year old building, it will need continual improvement, which I have seen during the 20 years I have lived here (\_\_\_ Marine Drive)., so please don't assume that this need for construction space will be a one time only event.

P.S. We are thinking of starting a petition. Does a petition carry any weight with the town council?

**Louise Daniell** – Marine Drive

DEAR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:

As a longstanding resident of the subject property, I would like to convey my vigorous opposition to the proposed four-storey apartment planned for the north end.

The structure in question would virtually eliminate the green space tenants have enjoyed for decades. Also, it would necessitate removal of several mature trees that form part of the Bronte canopy. Given the Town is doing everything possible to enhance the total number of trees, any development that mitigates against such a worthy goal raises serious questions.

Oakville prides itself on being the most livable community in the GTHA and beyond. Livable implies reasonable access to peace and quiet. Construction of the proposed development in the heart of a well-established residential area will significantly diminish the enjoyment of same for all parties concerned over an extended period.

Furthermore, residents of 2220 Marine Drive, many of whom seniors, will face major inconvenience due to the presence of construction vehicles and equipment, along with related activity. Suffice to say, the proposed development will be highly intrusive. Most assuredly, it will diminish the overall quality of life for those of us living in the existing building.

In the strongest possible language, I urge the Town to reject the application outright. Infill projects of this nature are neither warranted nor wanted due to the massive disruption that will surely ensue.

In closing, kindly advise approximately how long it will take Council to render a decision in this matter. When the decision has been made, I would appreciate being notified.

**Robert S.W. Mark** – Marine Drive

I wish to officially reserve my right of appeal in accordance with the provincial Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990,c. P.13, as amended and hereby submit the following preliminary comments regarding the proposed development at 2220 Marine Drive as referenced above.

I have a number of concerns including the following, regarding the above mentioned proposed development at 2220 Marine Drive.

I am strongly opposed to it for a number of reasons including the following:

- SAFETY due to increased traffic congestion
- Density – the proposed development will increase the density, which already exceeds what is currently permitted.
- Aesthetics – the proposed design is not in keeping with most of the surrounding neighborhood homes.
- Construction – the required construction will be very intensive and disruptive for likely the better part of two years or more and will further add to safety and traffic problems.

Your understanding in this matter will be appreciated. I will have further comments in due course which I trust will be helpful and constructive.

### **Moe & June Wiltse** - Marine Drive

My husband and I have been residents of 2220 Marine Drive for 41 years and have loved every minute of living in this building, as well as the peace and tranquility of living in this area.

The proposal of a four-storey apartment building on our beautiful front lawn is upsetting and distressing to say the least. It would totally destroy the look of our beautiful building, (our home), to say nothing of also destroying the look of this area of Bronte. It will basically look like a concrete jungle.

The construction of this structure will cause at least eighteen months, maybe longer, of noise, inconvenience, destruction to this area, and extra noise from the new tenants, upon completion. Also, please take into consideration the extra traffic and congestion it will cause.

I sincerely hope the town takes all of this into consideration before they make a decision on the proposal. Why must pure "greed" on the part a developer take precedent over having a little bit of green space which bring such joy and beauty to all the residents on Marine Drive? We are very proud to live here, and this proposed structure is extremely upsetting and distressing to all of us.

### **Ken Moffat** – Marine Drive

I am sending this message further to my previous correspondence with respect to the above not Development Application. My earlier correspondence expressed my objection to the inclusion of rooftop terraces on the basis of the incompatibility of such amenities with Liveable Oakville, The Official Plan of the Town of Oakville. On further investigation and analysis, I also object to the inclusion of rooftop terraces because the design of such amenities offends the relevant zoning by-laws. My zoning by-law related objections are both general and also more specifically related to setbacks of the proposed rooftop terraces.

### **General**

The following discussion references the Special Provision 82 (RH-82) applicable to the subject site; the general Residential Highrise Zoning (RH); and the zoning proposed in the Development Application. The Development Application states that "the zone provisions required by Specials

Provision 82 were established specifically for the development of the existing apartment building on the site and did not contemplate any changes.” (Page 29 – emphasis added). A comparison of all of the requirements of RH-82 and RH show that the existing building on the site could have been built within the constraints of the RH zoning designation. Accordingly, RH-82 should not be viewed as an accommodation of a particular development plan or building but rather as a specific and explicit constraint that was imposed by the Town on future development on this particular site. The Development Application attempts to justify the Proposed Development by reference to various esoteric planning principles and completely fails to address why the specific and explicit constraints that were imposed on this site should be set aside. I raise this general objection on the basis that my concern about rooftop terraces is more appropriately addressed by the Town withholding consent for the entire Development Application.

In the event that the Town is not persuaded by the forgoing general argument, following is my objection to the proposed setbacks of the rooftop terraces with specific references to the relevant sections of the Town of Oakville Zoning By-Law, in particular the provisions relating to setbacks. Provisions relating to setbacks are summarized in the following table:

		RH-82	RH	Proposed
Minimum Setbacks	Front yard (m)	51.50	7.50	5.00
	Interior side yard (m)	14.90	4.50	1.50
	Rooftop terraces (m)	2.00	2.00	?

### **Setbacks – Roof Edge**

Section 4.6.6(c) of the Town of Oakville Zoning By-Law requires, amongst other things, that rooftop terraces have a minimum setback of 2.0 metres from the edge of a roof. This requirement is applicable to both RH-82 and RH zones since this requirement is not varied by either. There is no discussion in the Development Application for the Proposed Development of a need to vary from this setback requirement and the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-Law does not include reference to setbacks for rooftop terraces (See Appendix C of the Development Application). In fact, the proposed Zoning By-Law amendment specifically states that “in all other respects the provision of By-law 2014-014 shall apply”.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the rooftop terraces depicted in the Architectural Plans that form part of the Development Application for the Proposed Development show a setback that is clearly less than 2.0 metres (See the Roof Plan – Drawing A205). This drawing does not provide dimensions for the setback provided for the rooftop terraces. However, based on the scale of the drawing, the setback depicted is no more than 0.7 metres, a shortfall of at least 1.3 metres from the requirement stipulated in Section 4.6.6(c) of the Zoning Bylaw.

If the Town is not persuaded to require the Development Application to be amended so that the rooftop terraces are eliminated entirely, I trust that safety concerns will cause the Town to require that the dimensions of the proposed rooftop terraces will be reduced so that the required setbacks for the proposed rooftop terraces will be respected.

### **Setbacks – Property Line with 2180 Marine Drive**

The table showing minimum setback requirements, above, indicates that front yard and side yard setbacks in the Proposed Development are approximately 1/10<sup>th</sup> of the corresponding minimum setback requirements of RH-82. The proposed setbacks are also substantially less than the minimum setbacks stipulated by the RH zoning that would otherwise apply. The setbacks proposed result in the easterly edge of the two eastern-most rooftop terraces being only approximately 2.2 metres (i.e. 1.5 metres + 0.7 metres = 2.2 metres) from the property line separating the Proposed Development and 2180 Marine Drive. Even if the requirements of RH-82 are ignored, the minimum setback requirements of RH would permit the rooftop terraces being no closer to the property line than 6.5 metres (4.5 metres + 2.0 metres = 6.5 metres). I note that the same objection relates to the front yard but this is not of concern to me so I will leave this objection to be raised by others for which this is a concern.

There is no rationale given in the Development Application for the Proposed Development to explain why exceptions to the front yard and side yard minimum setback requirements should be granted. In the absence of any rationale, I trust that the Town will, as a minimum, enforce the side yard setback requirements of the RH zoning so that the building and, more particularly, the rooftop terraces, will be an appropriate distance from the property line separating the Proposed Development from 2180 Marine Drive.

Thank you for your consideration of the foregoing.