

From: Jennifer G
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2024 12:19 PM
To: COA <coa@brampton.ca>
Cc: Ted Personal Ives Jennifer G
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Opposition Application file A-2024-0041

Caution: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments that you do not trust or are not expecting.

To: Committee of Adjustment,

As long time residents of Brampton, specifically the Ridgehill community, and the immediate surrounding area of 4 Alderway Ave Brampton, we strongly oppose the application to the Committee of Adjustment for all variances applied for in the above noted application.

As residents of this area we are deeply concerned about the negative impact the approval of these variances would have on our neighbourhood.

The proposed below grade entrance is NOT allowed according to the Brampton Zoning By law 10.23.1 "...exterior stairways constructed below the established grade shall NOT be located in a required side yard or front yard". This would be a significant deviation from the zoning bylaws that are in place to maintain the character and safety of our mature neighborhood. We are requesting that the CoA decline this application/special permission request as this cannot be considered 'minor in nature', especially given this is a corner lot - which requires extra due diligence when considering zoning variance(s) requests.

As residents, we also strongly oppose the proposal to extend the driveway to 26.57 feet where the by law limits the driveway to 22 feet. The existing driveway is proportional to the house as well as consistent to the houses in our neighbourhood and maintains our green space,

especially given there is a beautiful and very mature tree that would have its root system compromised if the driveway was unnaturally extended.

The proposed driveway also extends over 5 feet onto city property. According to 10.9.1 (A.) “....for each dwelling unit within a single detached dwelling, semi-detached dwelling, duplex dwelling, triplex dwelling.....a minimum of two parking spaces is required. As mentioned above - the back half of the driveway is on city property and the property - this property cannot accommodate 2 spots per unit.

Additionally, we are extremely concerned about the additional increase in traffic in this area as there is an Elementary school, Ridgeview P.S. approximately 200m away. A significantly wider driveway would bring more cars to an already congested area where parents park for pick-up and school buses travel. There are no sidewalks in this area - additional traffic would compromise pedestrian safety - jeopardizing our most vulnerable - our children walking home from school- and often their grandparent caregivers. It has become increasingly difficult to walk safely in this neighbourhood - allowing more cars would further exacerbate an already significant issue.

The diagram also notes a “secondary units entrance”, this appears to be a primary entrance for Unit 1 - which does not provide for, “an unobstructed pedestrian path of travel having a minimum width of 1.2 meters shall be provided along any portion of the yard extending from the front wall of the building to the door used as the principal entrance to an attached ARU unless the principal entrance to the attached ARU has direct unobstructed access having a minimum width of 1.2 meters from a public street or a private laneway at the rear of the property” according to 10.16.1 Provisions for Two-Unit and Three-Unit Dwellings. As you can see, the entrances do not comply with zoning requirements.

We urge the Committee of Adjustment to carefully consider all the negative consequences of these variance requests to this property and equally as important to this neighbourhood.

Granting this request would not only be detrimental to the safety and character of our community but also undermine the integrity of our zoning bylaws, especially given we are within the boundaries of the **designated Mature Neighbourhood** - which was also omitted in this application.

The proposed changes are NOT an improvement to this property and the properties in this neighbourhood and are not in the best interest of the public and community. We respectfully request the Committee of Adjustments decline/reject this application.

In addition to opposition to this application, we object to the number of second units that are being proposed and moving forward in the neighbourhood. It is a significant increase in density to the neighbourhood - with no increase in taxes to cover the increased costs of additional people in the community.

We understand the need for increased housing - but additional plans need to be made in a systematic, well thought out way in accordance with property and community considerations.

Ridgehill neighbourhood has been a long sought after Brampton neighbourhood to reside in for more than 50 years. These changes are detrimental to the safety of the community and its property values.

I previously moved to this neighbourhood - 20 years -ago from the Kennedy and Voddan area in Brampton, as rental properties went awry- that had resulted in increased drug trafficking, use and violence and no property maintenance.

We decided to stay in Brampton as many residents decided to leave for Georgetown and Oakville areas. We moved to the Ridgehill community 20 years ago because of the nature of the neighbourhood -the space, well cared for residences and maintained property values and to stay in our community - Brampton. We want to age in place in our community - but if these changes in our neighbourhood continue we will have to leave for our own physical safety and well being. This will also come at a financial cost to us - as property values decline - with increased rentals and density.

Ridgehill has historically been a neighbourhood where professionals and families sought to reside and work in Brampton. Please carefully consider all of the voices of the community, not just rental landlords, and how your decisions affect the Brampton community as a whole as you make these important decisions for the Ridgehill community.

You have our permission to post this letter to the agenda,

Respectfully, and with great concern,

Jennifer Glass and Edwin (Ted) Ives
31 Alderway Ave
Brampton
L6Y 2B8