

From:
To: [Committee of Adjustment \(SM\)](#)
Cc:
Subject: 351 Blucher- Minor Variance Refusal
Date: March 11, 2024 10:31:48 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern,

It is with my sincere frustration that I am having to write this email. It has come to our attention that our neighboring property has applied for a minor variance to build an Additional Dwelling Unit, in their tiny back yard, in our tiny neighborhood.

The request is to increase the allowable bylaws on the size of the home, and bending the bylaws for allowable access, simply because the lots are too small. Exceptions should not be made for the greed of one landlord. If allowed, what will stop adjacent homes from doing the same under the same allowances you create for this one landlord.

The impact of course, will be on neighbouring properties, both in the immediate and general area. The primary issues are related to loss of sunlight, privacy, views, openness and overall spacing. Other things to be considered are the removal of trees, parking, drainage, traffic and noise. Which will all be affected by the sheer mass and size of the requested building. These type of building allowances are incompatible with the established form and character of the neighborhood. It erodes the aesthetics of the surrounding homes, street scapes and more specifically our property.

Aside from the sight of the proposed A.D.U, the fact that such variances need to be made to accommodate what is deemed as a "tiny home" should be proof enough that this is quite literally, not the right fit. While the builder can control the size of the building, as can the city, no one can control the amount of stuff that comes with having a tenant. Maxing out space for the building will remove available outside space for personal items. Which will in turn clutter the lot, creating safety issues and increasing the already high rat population that thrive in this unkept rental lot.

We have 3 vehicles, the current tenants have 3 vehicles and the home to the right of them have 4 vehicles. Street parking is already limited, creating safety issues for the children on the street who play basketball. Without knowing the plans in full, the only way to accommodate the new tenant parking will be front lawn parking. Which is not the feel of our neighborhood or esthetically pleasing to anyone who pays taxes to live here.

Our block of homes and neighbors is a small home community that takes pride in the homes we have bought and maintain. This will be the second tiny home this particular landlord will have stuffed into our community. His other rentals have already made an impact on the formerly quiet, and well kept neighborhood. Certain bylaws are already not being met with the current tenants such as; grass cutting, snow removal and having full mechanic operations in the driveway, where engines are being removed and cars are being worked on, daily. All of which stand out, proving this neighborhood is not the right fit for this type of expansion. An argument can be made that we can call by law with any issues that may arise, but the whole purpose of this is to avoid a world where we have to continuously call bylaw on our neighbour's. We are not ones to complain and have accepted and dealt with a lot of

the concerns we already have with the current renters. Rest assured, if this proposed A.D.U is passed, we will not remain quiet and continuous calls to bylaw will be made, wasting everyone's time and valuable resources.

Our lots are just as small as the homes them selves, leaving our already limited outside space of the up most importance. We have put a lot of time and money to create a space for ourselves, putting up fences and decks and installing back yard gardens. All of which will be affected by the light and noise pollution, sight lines right into our back yard and everything else that comes with cramming 2 homes on 1 tiny lot. We have also invested a lot of money to upgrade the inside of our home. While understanding the current need for homes, and letting people have access to housing, we can't forget that this is steaming from greed and not to assist renters out of the kindness of his heart. If so, the price of the rental wouldn't be compariable to that of a full home. Our neighborhood is a perfect starter home community for a new family, with surrounding parks and schools. Stacking investors rentals in back yards will decimate the appeal and special feel of the surrounding homes. In this particular instance, you will be allowing the greed of one landlord to trump the ability of a new home buyer to have a fighting chance in the housing market. It could also have an effect of the resale price of our home as not very many people will be willing to have such an eyesore in their "private" back yard.

While selfishly devastated by the impact it will have on our family and our home, it will create a ripple affect of disappointment and let downs. Once this is approved, it will continue to happen. Ruining this historically beautiful, small home community. Respectfully, I am asking that we draw the line where it is clear and choose a more fitting neighborhood for these type of expansions. After speaking with many of the surrounding homes, there's not one person who agrees with what this specific landlord is doing to our block community and are already fed up with the state of affairs and his current rentals. (Signed petitions to follow)

Thank you for taking the time to read over some of our concerns! Attempts are being made to present at the meeting on March 19th at 10am but do to the time in which this meeting is being held, we will have to get time off work.

Kind regards,

Andrea Oliver ()
Josh Dietrich