

March 23, 2019,

Town of Oakville Council
c/o the Town Clerk at the Town of Oakville
Clerk's Department, 1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
Via email: TownClerk@Oakville.ca

RE: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment, 79 Wilson Street, File No. Z 1715.23, Ward 2

Attn: Mayor, Council and City Staff:

As a supplement to our verbal submission on March 18, 2019 we would like to emphasize the following points:

- We do not object specifically to the increase in density, from one unit to two, proposed on the property immediately to the South to our home at [REDACTED] Wilson Street. A development which directly affects 7 of the 14 apartments.
- We *are* concerned by the building size and some aspects of the design. It is not clear if the building exceeds the 35% maximum coverage of the site – it appears to, especially if the extensive porches are included.
- The proposal is to remove 2 city trees and 5 trees on the property without replacing any of the trees removed. While the larger footprint of the building – including a proposed increase in the maximum projection of the porch in the front yard from 1.5m to 2.39m – reduces the chance for landscaping, it would be possible to replace at least one of the City trees in the boulevard freed up by the relocation of the shared lane along the shared property line.
- It is interesting that the extended porch is required for outside access to two basement bedrooms, presumably to facilitate future use as separate units.
- The occupants of [REDACTED] Burnet, immediately south of 79 Wilson, who spoke in the information session on March 18th, are under the impression that the new building will be only slightly taller than their own roof peak. They should be aware that the building will be a full story taller than their home and essentially the same height (12m-increased from 10.5m) as the 3 ½ storey apartment building at [REDACTED] Wilson.
- The plans proposed show a pair of “mechanical mezzanines” (total of 278sf) that appear to be larger than most of the bedrooms below. If these are not mechanical they should be minimally sized to suit the roof access required and should not be habitable. If they constitute a 4th level this is no longer a Part 9 - Small building and should be designed according to Part 3 & 4 of the building code, and exits should be provided from the floor below.
- If a roof deck is provided it should be set back 2m from the edge of the flat roof area not from the eave edge of the sloped roof 2 stories below. I am assuming that the 2m setback is a by-law requirement to provide some privacy to the yards of the surrounding properties. This arrangement provides no comparable privacy for the yards - or the bedroom windows of the apartment building adjacent.

We wish to retain the right to appeal any decision of the Oakville Council to the LPAT.

Sincerely,



Stephen Blood

And other Occupants of [REDACTED] Wilson Street