

-----Original Message-----

From: Gianni Marcon

Sent: 2024/12/04 11:28 AM

To: COA <coa@brampton.ca>

Subject: [EXTERNAL]Renewed Objection to 4 Alderway Ave Additional COA Request for Variance

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 Members of the COA:

As a 40 year resident of Brampton I wish to express my strenuous objection to the application for 4 Alderway Avenue. The variance being requested has been before the COA previously and has previously been rejected. The widening of the driveway was part of this applicant's persistent attempts to shoehorn a third ARU into a corner lot that this COA has already ruled is unsuited for the proposed usage. As such it is totally unacceptable and undesirable.

The proposed variance to the corner lot in question is seriously flawed as it compromises the safety of drivers, pedestrians, parents, students and local residents. The proposed driveway expansion presents a number of issues as it further compromises safety in terms of traffic, drainage due to additional hardscape and damage to mature trees. With a populous elementary school steps away from the proposed expansion compromise the safety of all who frequent this area at peak periods as well as the property owners who reside in the neighbourhood.

Also the mature and majestic copper beech that has both adorned the neighbourhood and served as a critical art of the drainage system in the immediate area is at significant risk as a result of what is being proposed. This very large tree is a species that is notorious for its sensitive root system, which if compromised in any way, would result in its untimely demise. In reviewing the proposed variance there is no arborist report even mentioning the impacted copper beech. Had one been done the fact that the extensive widening would cause a 50 year old tree to be sacrificed. As such this excessively, unnecessary proposal is both unethical and undesirable.

At a previous meeting members of the COA emphatically stated that proposals of this nature that significantly increase the hardscape ratio of properties are undesirable as they negatively impact prevailing drainage systems that result in the types of flooding we witnessed on multiple occasions

this past summer . A number of the homes of residents in the area were flooded. Exacerbating the problem by allowing addition and significant hardscape is frankly unacceptable and not in anyone's interest. In fact a previous COA meeting the issue of hardscape increases has been discussed and addressed by the committee. Not only have applications that would have resulted in hardscape increases been rejected by the COA but long-standing hardscape modifications that were in already in place were required to be undone. Some of these required undoing/demolitions of driveway and walkway additions and widening were much more modest than what is being currently applied for at 4 Alderway and as a result a continued consistent approach to prevent such continued and unrestricted variances must continue to be applied.

It is the shared view of I and many of my neighbours that this particular application has been continues to be a cynical and inappropriate over reach . It is not in keeping with existing by laws nor the character of the existing mature neighbourhood. The fact that the applicant went ahead with creating a 3rd ARU after his original application was denied, after his project was shut down by the TSSA and the Ministry of Labour, after a Global news story highlighted the applicants blatant disregard for the most basic requirements - no locates, no permits, no safety compliance for workers on site etc, should all be factored into the equation when considering this most recent (and previously denied) variance reapplication. No credit should be given to any argument that this variance is merely a final touch required to allow for the utilization of a 3rd ARU. The applicant knew all along that the driveway widening would have to be approved in order to operationalize his for profit venture. He took a risk in the cynical hope that the COA would provide him the latitude to achieve his personal goals. His attempts to reverse engineer an outcome and represent this application as merely a "minor" variance that puts a bow on his "gift "to the city and province is disingenuous.. I urge the COA to not be duped or enticed by the cynical and self - serving tactics that continue to be employed by the absentee owner of 4 Alderway Ave.

In general it is important to note that when the only investment in a community neighbourhood is financial there are negative consequences. Absentee landlords who invest in multiple properties that they neglect to maintain, often show little regard for the neighbourhoods that they buy up through their numbered companies. The ensuing deterioration of property standards and property values is predictable and precedent setting.

Existing by laws and planning guidelines have been prudently established to provide guide rails that ensure neighbourhood maintenance standards and character are maintained. Variances to existing bylaws - especially ones like the one that is the subject of this email - need to be rigorously reviewed and accordingly rejected.

I urge the COA to reject the proposed variance that would result in a disproportionate, significant increase in hardscape and a compromising of safety in the area in and around 4 Alderway Avenue.

Finally . I welcome the opportunity to delegate the COA at the December 10, 2024 meeting where this application in question will be heard. In addition I give permission for this letter/ email to be posted as part of the process.

Gian Marcon

22 Alderway Avenue

Brampton, Ontario

L6Y 2B7