

Myers, Jeanie

From: adeola adeyinka
Sent: 2022/07/09 4:21 PM
To: Myers, Jeanie
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Re: Brampton Committee of Adjustment Meeting - July 12, 2022 - A-2022-0194 - Written Submissions

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

Adeola Olomola
26 Haymarket Drive,
Brampton, ON L7A5C3

To:

The Secretary - Treasurer,
Committee of Adjustment, City Clerk's Office
Brampton City Hall, 2 Wellington Street West,
Brampton, Ontario, L6Y4R2

RE: WRITTEN SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE FILE A-2022-0194

Dear Committee of Adjustment Panel, I, the applicant hereby bring to you my written submission with respect to the above named subject matter and a recommendation that the Application be approved.

I have read the submissions of His/her Francois Hemon- Morneau, planner 1 and hereby present an opposing opinion which addresses some of her perceived concerns which underlined the reason for her position with respect to this application.

The application is requesting a minor variance to permit a second unit dwelling within an existing back to back corner lot duplex townhouse. The corner lots of the back to back townhouse is no different than a row townhouse which the planning act authorizes use of additional residential units.

His/Her position is that the variance requested would require me to construct a separate side entrance and modify basement windows which might affect the structural integrity and since the constructed subdivision is not yet assumed by the city, the onus is/was on the developer to have this completed if in fact it was within the original intent of the construction building for the corner lots townhomes.

The information which was not accurate in her submission was the fact that the developer has already been permitted by the city to construct and has already constructed a separate side entrance to the property as at when the house was delivered upon purchase.

Therefore there is no need to construct a new separate side entrance (this addresses and nullifies his/her position on the effects of having a new construction take place). Secondly, there are currently 3 windows in the basement section area of the house and the only thing required upon the approval of this minor variance is to replace only one of the existing windows to a bigger size as per requirement.

Furthermore, his/her other mention was that the builder is responsible for the construction requirements until the subdivision is assumed. As part of the submission and the drawings the builder provided which was already approved by the city was an "unfinished basement" portion of the house. In cases where the intent is not to accommodate a second unit dwelling; the space would be referred to as a "flex space". In addition, the electrical and plumbing of the house has also been structured in accordance to the city requirement to accommodate a second unit dwelling which the builder already included a 3pcs rough in in the basement area to accommodate a full washroom in the allocated portion of the basement. I thereby humbly submit that the house in question which is a corner unit lot of the block of town house back to back units with a side yard and an already constructed separate side entrance by the builder was in fact intended for a second unit dwelling purposes and as such the variance requested is minor in nature

Lastly, in terms of residential density of the geographical location, the house (corner unit lot) is situated amongst other semi detached and full detached houses which were also intended to accommodate second unit dwellings. Hence, the density is not affected if the corner unit lots designed to accommodate a second unit dwelling is utilized as such.

Based on my submissions which has adequately addressed the misconception and inaccurate information provided by his/her; I would please request that the minor variance be granted accordingly.

Thank you,

Adeola Olomola