

Myers, Jeanie

From: Karen Walsh*
Sent: 2020/10/14 11:32 PM
To: Myers, Jeanie
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Application for Minor Variance - Application #A-2020-0084 - Ward #1 - 57 Rosebud Avenue, Brampton (Bagri)

October 14, 2020

ATTENTION: Jeanie Myers, Secretary-Treasurer
Committee of Adjustment
City Clerk's Office, Brampton City Hall
2 Wellington St. W.
Brampton, ON
L6Y 4R2

This e-mail speaks to the Application for Minor Variances – Application #A-2020-0084 – Ward #1 – involving Lot 58, Plan 43M-486 – 57 Rosebud Avenue, Brampton (Amit Bagri & Devika Bagri)

Summary Statement

The intentions behind the above-noted Variances are not in the best interests of Rosebud Avenue, either as a physical entity, or the benefit of the Rosebud Avenue neighbourhood. The consequences would be far-reaching and long-lasting and detract from the enjoyment of neighbouring properties. In addition, property values on Rosebud Avenue would be impacted negatively by multi-unit dwellings. There would also be a significant negative impact on EMS if they were required to attend the property for pool related situation.

Variance #1 – Exterior stairway to a below grade entrance – OBJECTION

The homes on Rosebud Avenue(hereinafter referred to as Rosebud) were built as single family dwellings. The addition of an exterior access door to the interior basement portion of the house contravenes an existing By-Law created to preserve neighbourhoods and a supporting tax base. The intent of this addition of an exterior access door opens the Property to offer a basement rental unit, legal or otherwise, to which we vehemently oppose, and could easily become a multi-unit rental property if the Applicants move out.

There is already a significant issue with parking on Rosebud, and there is excessive on-street parking with and without permits. The majority of houses have single car garages and the driveways were built for a single vehicle. The majority of houses on Rosebud have at least 2 vehicles. The potential to have a vehicle parked on the road pending access to the garage/driveway would only add to the parking chaos. Couple this with a business in the basement at 72 Rosebud(Brampton Colonics) that has clients coming and going, and Rosebud being a "shortcut" both from the No Frills store at the east end of the street, and also from Isabella to Vodden St.W. and vice versa, it is quite dangerous at times due to moving and parked vehicles and excessive speed.

Already there are 2 other houses on Rosebud Avenue with exterior basement accesses that were done in recent years, 13 Rosebud Avenue and 72 Rosebud Avenue, and they have not made a positive contribution to the Street. One is for a basement rental unit, while the other is for a business.

A rental unit would not be supporting the tax base, and contributing to the financial upkeep of the wear and tear on the many infrastructures such as roads, utilities, Emergency Services, etc.

The pool on the property presents a safety concern if there are young children, youth or unruly renters on the property. There would be no regard for property lines if they were wanting access to the pool. Additionally, there is very little room on the property for children or youth to play. The pool presents a hazard in the back yard, and there is little room in the front yard.

Snow removal on Rosebud is already a huge issue with parked cars and lack of space to put snow from sidewalks and driveways. Adding in additional vehicle(s) and snow removal to access the proposed exterior below grade access stairway would only add to the snow removal issues. The property has a large green hydro box on the east side of the driveway which would add to the reduced area to pile snow.

Variance #2 – Interior side setback of 0.54m – OBJECTION

The original intent of a minimum interior side yard setback of 1.2m was created for good reason, and over the years with narrow properties becoming the norm, the setbacks have become more important for general accessibility to one's own property. Encroachment on the side yard property belonging to 59 Rosebud would be the most likely outcome of making the setback 0.66m shorter and would negatively impact their property value and enjoyment.

Variance #3 – Lot coverage increase from 30% to 32.41% -

OBJECTION

Looking at the plan provided to us by the City of Brampton, the increase in lot coverage appears to be due to the proposed addition of the exterior stairway on the interior side yard and to the egress window on the opposite side of the house. The encroachment on the side yard property belonging to 59 Rosebud would be the most likely outcome of allowing the lot coverage increase. To get around the exterior staircase with walking, or taking anything like patio furniture, etc., from the front to the rear of the house, or vice versa, would, with only 0.53m in width to do it, nearly impossible, especially so if the neighbour at 59 Rosebud were to install a fence. EMS would be unable to access the backyard if required for a pool-related incident – a stretcher would not fit down the west side of the Applicants' house.

Snow removal from the proposed stairway and walkway to access the stairway would be awkward, so as to not put it onto the neighbouring property at 59 Rosebud. The small size of the front lawn doesn't leave much room to pile snow.

While it is important to have an egress window, if it was to be used, the exit would be onto property belonging to 55 Rosebud. If that neighbour(55 Rosebud) were to put up a fence, the egress window would not be as effective, thereby compromising safety.

Any basic exterior maintenance to the east and west sides of the Applicant's property would require access to neighbouring properties (both 55 & 59 Rosebud) with the inaccessibility to the side yards of their own home.

Variance #4 – Interior side yard setback of 0.94m rather than 1.2m for proposed below grade window -

OBJECTION

With few exceptions, the houses on Rosebud have their east side without windows, and their backyard access on their west side. The original building plan allowed more width on the west side than the east side of most of the homes on Rosebud. The properties being so narrow, this east/west configuration offers an element of privacy. The addition of a below grade (egress) window would project out from the house with a window well(to enable it to be an egress window) structure towards the side yard property belonging to 55 Rosebud, presenting a potentially serious safety issue for children and adults alike, and EMS if they are on scene for any reason. This is

the backyard access side for the property at 55 Rosebud. Access to the Applicants' own backyard would be compromised as well, if they were to move it from the west side of their house to the east side, by the window well structure.

As stated above, the egress window would be exiting onto the property at 55 Rosebud. If the property owner at 55 Rosebud installed a fence down their west side, it would make exiting the window difficult for the basement occupant(s).

Variance #5 – Interior side yard setback of 0.94m rather than 1.2m for as-built additions –

NO OBJECTION

No objection to this Variance as it is specifically to correct an error made by Calvert Dale Estates(builder) when the house was built.

Variance #6 – Accessory structure (shed) having 0.0m setback –

NO OBJECTION

No objection to this Variance as the shed is along the back property line and not in the typical area for entertaining on the adjoining properties.

Variance #7 – Existing hot tub side yard setback of 0.4m rather than 1.2m –

NO OBJECTION WITH PROVISIO

No objection to this Variance WITH THE PROVISIO that when the hot tub is replaced at a future date, that the proper side yard setback be 1.2m, and this condition be written into future sale agreements, if possible, until compliance with the by-law's minimum setback of 1.2m. The hot tub is in close proximity to an area that would reasonably be used for entertaining.

SUBMITTED BY:

Karen Walsh

Home Owner
54 Rosebud Avenue
Brampton, ON
L6X 2W5

F. Murray Walsh

Home Owner
54 Rosebud Avenue
Brampton, ON
L6X 2W5
