

Re: **Application number A - 38 / 20**
Minor Variance – 104 Winston Crescent

We are opposed to the variance requests as presented. There is no apparent hardship that would require exceeding the setbacks which are there to protect the neighbours privacy and enjoyment of our own lots. This proposal is not what we would consider a minor variance. The proposal appears to be an attempt to maximize economic benefit to the proponent at the cost of the neighbouring properties.

The request and the reasons to oppose are as follows:

a) Requesting left side yard setback of 1.2 metres vs By-Law requirement of 1.5 metres

Opposed to this request

* The addition would negatively impact the property value of adjacent 102 Winston as the driveway will have a full length two-story wall. This will also impact airflow to 102 Winston. At the very least the minimum setback must be adhered to.

b) Requesting rear yard setback of 4.38 metres vs By-Law requirement of 7.5 metres or 20% of lot depth

Opposed to this request

* The size and closeness to adjoining backyards will be intrusive and will reduce the property values of 59 Franklin and 57 Franklin as well as 102 Winston Crescent.

* The proposed 2nd dwelling/apartment will have a living room and loft bedroom view into the backyards of 57 Franklin and 59 Franklin. An infringement of privacy for the adjoining backyards.

* Yards are relatively small and putting an addition of that size, so close to the back would be an infringement of privacy.

c) Requesting new apartment size of 95.5 square metres and 30.4% of total floor area (including proposed addition).

Opposed to this request

* By-Law provides for accessory of 47.835 square metres at 45% of current residence. The request is 100% larger or double what is governed by the By-Law. This is essentially a full 2nd residence which extends into the backyard and over the By-Law variances. This is intrusive.

* The intent of the By-Law is to establish an accessory apartment only. The request does not adhere to the intent and instead appears to be an attempt to establish a full size 2nd residence.

- * The addition of the accessory apartment essentially transforms the single residence lot to a semi detached two family lot. The total area is just 10.8 square meters smaller than the current residence. The lot is too small for two residences.
- * The additional residence / apartment will increase the amount of traffic in an area that is inhabited by an older population, more than half being widowed/single retired females.
- * It is probable that taxes would increase within the neighbourhood with a 2nd dwelling/ apartment included.
- * The proposed attached apartment is a rectangular extension into the backyard, which creates a barrier to the safe passage of wildlife.
- * Given the size of the proposed apartment, it is probable that this and perhaps the entire property would be transformed into a rental / income generating property, thereby reducing the property values of neighbouring residences. Note that the current owner does not reside at the property in question.
- * The second story porch in the backyard will overlook several backyards and the impact on privacy for these properties will be greatly exacerbated by the height of the proposed addition. This poses a significant impact to the Franklin Avenue, Bennet Avenue and Winston Crescent resident's ability to enjoy their yards as a private retreat.

As well:

Two story addition will alter air flow for neighbouring properties which consist of bungalos and 1.5 story single detached.

The proposal does not fit the character of the impacted neighbourhood and is well outside of what a city that prides itself on being "green" should support. We instead should be promoting minimum footprints and minimum environmental impacts.

To conclude, we are opposed to the requests for variances as presented. There is no apparent hardship to the applicant, that would require exceeding the setbacks which are there to protect the neighbours privacy and enjoyment of our own lots. We are not opposed to renovations but there is no apparent rationale for the proposed variances other than economic gain for the proponent at the expense of the neighbours. The proposed design should fit within the context of the neighbourhood and this is well out of proportion. We respectfully request that you reject this variance application and request a revised proposal from the proponents that works within established set-backs and area restrictions.

Thank you,
Patricia Botter, Marianne Botter
59 Franklin Ave.