

B-2022-0003; A-2022-0047; A-2022-0048

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2023

Committee of Adjustment,

CITY CLERK OFFICE

I'm writing to request that you deny the request for deferral and deny the request for minor variance.

The proponent keeps asking for more time to figure out more ways to circumvent existing rules and by-laws that are meant to protect Brampton residents and the integrity and viability of livable neighbourhoods. After reading the Heritage Impact Assessment, it is clear that the property is of historic significance, the house should not be demolished, and the lot should not be divided. The report clearly states that demolition of 43 David would have a *direct impact to the historic fabric of the area and the overall appearance of the surrounding streetscape*.

The proponent has used a creative interpretation of a four-step test to suggest that that the minor variance should be granted. I refute their interpretation.

In response to the intent of the by-law:

- The intent of the by-law is to have *one* single detached home on the existing lot, not two tiny lots with one detached home on each, filling the entire space.

In response to meeting the needs of the Official plan:

- David St. itself does not need residential intensification. I understand that in general, efforts are being made to intensify density in downtown Brampton, but this does not mean that every single street needs to have increased residential density. Four new multi-story buildings have been or will be built in the next few years on Railroad St (2 built + townhouses), Thomas St (under development) and Main (and Church Sts.). These buildings represent a significant amount of increased density, adding two additional structures for two additional families is not representative of the intent of the City plan.
- David St. should continue to be zoned for individual detached family dwellings to maintain the sense of neighbourhood that has been developed amongst the neighbours on the street. You may remember from my first submission that I recounted how most neighbours on that section of David St. know each other by name and spend time talking to each other and helping each other when they are in need. The request to divide this lot, build structures that will not resemble the look and feel of the surrounding structures will effectively tear the fabric of historic integrity of the neighbourhood. It will also cut off the neighbours at 45 David from the rest of the neighbours.

In response to whether the proposal is desirable:

- The proposal is categorically undesirable to the current residents of the neighbourhood. In order to maintain the historic look and feel of the neighbourhood as well as privacy, there is no desire to fill up every perceived space with structures.
- The proponent gives an example of the townhouses on Market St. This is not a similar comparison because:
 1. The proponent is not proposing a similar structure, and

2. It is my understanding that those particular townhouses are problematic as they were poorly constructed and are unstable. That is not a good example of good planning.

- For these reasons, this comparison should be disregarded.
- Constructing two very tall, narrow structures will affect the neighbourhood and the streetscape. With such narrow lots, we can expect that the proposed structures will be constructed as close to the street as possible. This will lead to the structures coming almost to the sidewalk and blocking the view of the neighbourhood, and, as previously mentioned, physically cutting off the neighbours at 45 David from the rest of the street.
- We have no guarantee that there will be any effort made for the structures built to fit into the style of the neighbourhood, which the HIA so eloquently expresses. It is clear that the houses on David St. were constructed in the late 1800s and early 1900s. There is no indication or guarantee that any effort will be made to erect structures that blend into this style, meaning that it will surely affect the look and feel of the neighbourhood in a drastic way. Again, I implore the committee to look at the modern structure built at 26 Peel Ave. The modern look of 26 in amongst houses built in the early 1900s clearly tears the historic fabric of that neighbourhood. That house stands out and has a jarring effect to the eye and to the neighbourhood. Contrary to the proponent's documentation, the proposal is not desirable.

In response to the proposal being "minor" in nature:

- The proponent's sparse analysis of the amount of frontage may appear as "minor" however but the *effect* of the variance will be major for adjacent and surrounding properties and quality of life of surrounding residents. Noting that the HIA recognizes that #43 was built on a riverbank, and my property is on the edge of the historic riverbank, excavation activities and regrading will have a drastic affect on the flow of water, with the possibility of major flooding to my and surrounding properties.
- We can also expect that allowing this "minor" variance will open the door to allow building of structures right up to the property line, with very little space next to my property. Since my house faces north, the majority of the sun on and coming into my house is in the afternoon from the west. If tall structures are permitted to be built on the property line, that will eliminate almost all the sunlight from my property; the majority of my house and my property will be in a shadow.
- Tall structures on the property line will also eliminate any privacy I have in my house as well as in my backyard, as people in these structures would be able to look into my house and into my backyard.
- As I have noted before, the property immediately east of my house is already built up (and at sometimes over) my property line. There is no way to remedy this as it was done in the early 1900s. In 2023, we need to rely on the by-laws put in place to protect residents from this type of property infringement.
- Again, I'm asking this committee to carefully consider the result of allowing this "minor" variance leading to other "minor" variances, that could easily combine into a major impact on the surrounding areas.

I am grateful to the staff who put together the HIA and I ask that the committee take those recommendations seriously. If the committee continues to grant this proponent another postponement, then I would respectfully ask that the committee refer this to the engineering department to study how excavation and regrading of property will affect the surrounding properties, specifically related to possible flooding, and who would be responsible for mitigation of this possible flooding.

Let's be clear. What is being outlined in the proponent's report is not about the public good, it is the exact opposite. This proposal is about greed and increasing private wealth.

This proposal is not about providing housing supply. This is about one family making money and profiting of other's misery, by disrespecting the historic value of the neighbourhood and the residents who reside in it.

I work in the public sector, it is my job to think about what is in the public interest and what is good for Ontarians. I do not have the resources to hire a lawyer to fight this fight for me. I am proud of my neighbours who have mobilized against this proposal in support of maintaining the neighbourhood. This is another demonstration that this plan is not desirable.

I am asking the committee to do the right thing for the public good. Please adhere to the laws and regulations in place that allow neighbourhoods to preserve their character and sense of place. Please value the information in the HIA that explains the value and the character that the actual structure brings to the fabric and streetscape of the neighbourhood. Finally, please consider the negative impacts on the physical space on the surrounding properties due to flooding and lack of sunlight.

Jennifer Harewood
39 David St.