

**Sent:** Thursday, May 16, 2024 7:53 PM

**To:** COA <[coa@brampton.ca](mailto:coa@brampton.ca)>

**Cc:** Keenan, Dennis (Councillor) <[Dennis.Keenan@brampton.ca](mailto:Dennis.Keenan@brampton.ca)>; [Martin.mederios@brampton.ca](mailto:Martin.mederios@brampton.ca); mike fraser <[mcfraser@sympatico.ca](mailto:mcfraser@sympatico.ca)>

**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL]Application [A-2024-0041 \(4 Alderway Ave. Brampton, ON\)](#)-disputing application

To whom it may concern

Please review my objection once again to [4 Alderway ave Brampton](#)

May 2024 To: Committee of Adjustment, As residents of Brampton 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 community. 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 opposed 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 neighborhood 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 (picture included). 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 approximately 200m away - a significantly wider driveway brings more cars to an already congested area. There are no sidewalks in this area - additional traffic would compromise pedestrian safety - jeopardizing our most vulnerable - our kids walking home from school. It has become increasingly difficult to walk safely in this neighborhood - 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 designed Mature Neighbourhood - which was also omitted in this application. The proposed changes are not an improvement to this property and the properties in

this neighborhood and are not in the best interest of the public and community. We respectfully request the Committee of Adjustments decline/reject this application. Residents of the immediate vicinity,

*Regards,*

*Laurie*