

Submission to the Committee of Adjustment Application A-2022-0047, A-2022-0048 B-2022-0003

I am asking this committee to deny this application. I understand that the name of this adjustment is called a "minor variance," but the effect on my property and my family's quality of life will not be minor, it will be major.

I note that the committee is considering a site visit before making a decision. Not only to I urge the committee to make a site visit, I urge someone from the engineering and environment departments to observe and measure the degree of slope between the property at #43 and my property at #39 and consider the possible environmental effects of this variance.

I am incredibly concerned about the environmental impact that the division of property will have on my property as the grade of the land next to my house is very steep in some areas. I have serious concerns that any attempt to excavate and regrade the land will have a severe impact on my property and properties east of mine. I would request that an environmental impact assessment be undertaken to show how the movement of water over/under regraded land will affect my property (my house, the two-storey structure in the backyard, and my backyard) as well as my neighbours' properties. It looks to me as if my property could be subjected to serious flooding as a result of a project that attempts to expand the footprint beyond the current structure. It has been brought to my attention that a similar project was approved on David St. west of Mill St. which resulted in basement floods in the houses east of the new build. I have done my part to manage slope erosion on my property by planting several trees in the steep area at significant expense. But trees cannot stop erosion caused by a major excavation.

My guess is that excavation would not only affect my property, but the properties on Joseph St. behind the house will also be affected. Has any assessment been done to ensure that my and surrounding properties would not suffer major damage?

I would like to point out that after the river was diverted and a brick semidetached house was built to the east of my house c. 1910, the property was built up to and beyond the property line. The current driveway of #37 is actually infringes my property; there are parts of my house on the east side that actually hang over #37's driveway. Obviously, this property has existed like that for a long time, but when my real estate lawyer saw the property line, he promptly stated that building like that should not have been allowed to happen. Clearly, I can't do anything about what happened 100 years ago, and fortunately, I have a good relationship with my current neighbours at #37. But this shouldn't be allowed to happen again on the other side of my property.

Since the owner of #43 is trying to divide the property so narrowly, I presume that there will be an attempt to build the structure as close to the property line as possible, forcing another injustice on the other side of my house. If I wanted to live cheek-to-jowl in a huge house in a subdivision, I could live elsewhere in the city, but I actually wanted to live in a neighbourhood with heritage houses, an expansive backyard with a reasonable expectation of privacy.

Building additional structures on the property line to the west of my house will also have a significant impact on the access to natural light inside and around my house, not just because of the property line but also because of the elevation of the adjacent property. Since my house faces north, the main time that my house receives sunlight is in the afternoon when the sun is in the west. If the structure is permitted to be built on that elevation so close to the property line, that will cut my house off from almost all sunlight, especially in the winter.

The division of the property and subsequent building of structures up to the property line will also have a severe impact on my privacy due to the higher elevation of the property at #43 and one can assume that with such a narrow structure, builders will choose to build high structures meaning that the inhabitants will be able to look into areas of my house.

If this variance is granted it will irreparably tear at the fabric of this heritage style neighbourhood. I use the term "neighbourhood" very deliberately, since I would suggest that many of the neighbours on David St. from Isabella to Mill Streets are on a first name basis with each other, and we help each other out when we there is

Jennifer Harewood 39 David St.

a need. We are more than just neighbours that say "hi" in the driveway; we get updates on what's happening with our families and provide support when we can. I have been the recipient of much good will from the neighbours on David Street.

I mention these things because it appears to me as if the majority of the current property owners of David St. are invested in this neighbourhood and want to do what they can to make it better while they continue to live there, except for this applicant, who appears to be interested in creating income for himself and moving on, without any consideration of the esthetic, environmental or societal impact it will have on the neighbourhood.

You might think that the above points have nothing to do with property variances and new builds, but they do if you consider the attitude of the current property owner; much of their actions demonstrate that he is not truly interested in investing in the neighbourhood, but just in making a quick buck and moving on. The continued degrading of the exterior of the property demonstrates that he is not interested in making the location a home or investing in the neighbourhood.

I understand that there is a lot of media coverage about creating new housing supply. I agree that housing supply is important, but what might be more important is *affordable* housing. This application is for one property owner who is trying to make money on destroying the fabric of the neighbourhood. Let's be clear, this application is not about increasing housing supply, nor is it about creating affordable housing. Let's call this what it is, it is about one person trying to make fast money and then moving on to destroy another neighbourhood.

I was born in this city and have spent the majority of my life here. I went to school here; I worship here and I participate in community building in this city. I am committed to the improvement of this city and of my neighbourhood. This variance does not demonstrate any kind of improvement. It demonstrates a focus on profit over people, of greed of a few over the wellbeing of many.

Please remember that as voters with families living in Downtown Brampton, we are here for the long haul. We're renovating our homes and our backyards using local contractors, we're frequenting restaurants and entertainment venues in downtown, we're sending our children to local public schools, sports and music programs and continuing to build the human capital of Downtown Brampton.

If you are interested in what the people of David Street are doing to invest in Brampton's human capital, I urge you to deny this application.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Harewood (she/her)

Photos attached to show grade:
From backyard of 39 David looking west (up) at 43 David
From street, showing grade difference from 43 David on the right to driveway of 39 David on the left

Jennifer Harewood 39 David St.



