

## Pravina Attwala

---

**Subject:** FW: [External] File A125/22  
**Attachments:** Request to Speak - COAIZeppieriJuly28\_22.pdf

---

**From:** IRENE FORD  
**Sent:** July-25-22 1:59 PM  
**To:** Committee of Adjustment <CofA@vaughan.ca>  
**Cc:** Rosanna DeFrancesca <Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] File A125/22

Hello,

Please find my request to speak form for Thursday's meeting. Pictures will follow in a separate email. My comments and requests are as follows.

The existing mechanical shed proposed for 'reconstruction' does not meet the requested/proposed 0.61m/25.5" rear yard set back by-law exemption. If measured from the roof overhang the existing mechanical shed is w/in 24" of my property line - the rear yard set back. The existing mechanical shed sits at the centre of my backyard property line; it's old & has a 3 to 4 ft metal stack protruding from the roof. The proposed height requested is over 10' and will remain a dominant sight line feature from my backyard above my fence line. I suspect taller than what exists now (excluding the stack).

### Questions

Will the reconstructed shed have an exhaust stack?  
Where will proposed setbacks be measured from the foundation or roof overhang?  
What about noise from the pool equipment?  
What about storm water run-off from roof, where will it be directed?  
Why has a [zoning review waiver](#) not been completed or submitted?  
Does Building Standards have conditions of approval, it is not clearly identified in schedule B if they do or do not?  
Building inspections did not provide comments, do they have comments? Why is the word septic in quotations next to their line item?  
Please indicate what approvals are required for the bathroom/shower in the proposed cabana and what department is responsible for reviewing and issuing this permit? Note this was not identified in the public notice and it is only shown on the supporting drawing on pg 12 of the [staff report](#) - was this clearly identified to all commenting agencies/departments?  
There is reference to a sump pump releasing to a concrete pad on the drawing on pg. 10 of the [staff report](#) pdf, where is this located? When, where and how much water would be released?  
Why are there no comments provided from Development Engineering in Schedule B of the staff report? They have indicated a condition of approval for lot grading?

### Comments

The applicants provided planning justification that the City of Vaughan's zoning by-law is too restrictive is subjective and disregards why such setbacks have been established and approved by the City of Vaughan. Further it is not just one structure but all structures existing and proposed that the applicant seeks by-law exemptions for. As I understand the distances in the by-laws are set as a guide to ensure that structures built in ones own backyard do not disrespect, encroach or interfere with the the reasonable use and enjoyment of residents in abutting yards. I would argue that the applicants planning justification is inadequate. The mere fact that they want to expand the recreational uses in a manner that is not consistent with the city's by-laws does not mean they are too restrictive only that they are not consistent with what they would like to build in their backyard. I also find this rational dismissive of legitimate and valid concerns that neighbours likely have. That being said I am thankful that the applicant is seeking the appropriate permits and that I have been provided this opportunity to offer comments. I also appreciate that their yard is irregularly shaped and some of the requests are not unreasonable.

The below comment on pg. 21 from development planning makes little sense to me. These features do little for the neighbours with rear yard set-backs on Father Ermanno. What screens the development for residents at 85, 89 and 91 Father Ermanno? 85 fully abutts 24 Monica Court as does half of 89 Father Ermanno. The latter has not one but two pool sheds abutting their backyard. No such concern has been expressed regarding sight lines and drainage for the existing reconstruction of the mechanical shed (granted a smaller structure). Further the cabana rear yard setback appears to be measured from the foundation of the cabana, not the roof line. Is the distance from the back of the built in BBQ counter 1.42m/~4.5' vs. 1.92m/>6'? Is this large enough to plant trees and allow them room to grow, as depicted on the drawing?

*"The Development Planning Department has no objection to Variances 3 and 9 for the revised attached cabana. The cabana will be screened to the south by existing trees on 27 Monica Court and to the west by a shed on 79 Father Ermanno Crescent. The applicant has also proposed tree plantings between the cabana and rear fence to further screen the cabana from the neighbouring properties to the rear. The proposed 1.92 m setback will also facilitate safe access and drainage."*

### Requests

**Our preference is that the mechanical shed complies with the current by-law and is set back 2.4m/>7'. Failing this we do not believe that 0.65m is satisfactory. We request the following of the Committee of Adjustment (CofA):**

- 1) require a set back of 1.55m/~5ft from the rear yard set back if measured from the foundation or at least half the required distance 1.4m/~48" if measured from the widest point (roof overhang);**
- 2) the drawings clearly show the existing mechanical shed location and distances from property lines both foundation and roof overhang;**
- 3) clearly identify that the existing mechanical shed to be reconstructed will be relocated to comply with the existing/proposed by-law exemption as approved by CofA;**
- 4) identify how setbacks will be measured from foundation or widest point of structure (e.g. roof overhang), if measured from the foundation then consider increasing setbacks to accommodate roof overhangs; and,**
- 5) ensure all conditions of approval are known and clearly identified from departments, commenting agencies (e.g. sanitary, grading).**

I believe these requests will ensure the reasonable use and enjoyment of neighbouring properties and reduce opportunities for adverse impacts from water run-off, inadequate drainage, noise and aesthetics/sight lines.

Based on the information provided by staff it was very difficult to ascertain what is being proposed versus what's existing (pool/mechanical shed) and/or being proposed as new (cabana, shed). A general comment for CofA and staff consideration is to include drawings that identify locations of proposed structures as well as existing versus new, if feasible. This would be beneficial to Vaughan residents, neighbours and perhaps help reduce conflict at the construction stage when residents typically start to comprehend the scale and size of what is being proposed.

I purchased my home knowingly with 2 sheds that presumably house pool equipment, likely within 2ft of my property line. I have not complained to by-law or taken any action. However, since the applicant is seeking approvals to undergo renovations I feel it is important to come forward to present my concerns. My main concern is that the mechanical shed will be rebuilt in it's current location and remain less than 2' from my property line which dominates the sight line in my backyard. My secondary concern are that more structures will be built that do not respect the City's property setback requirements and this will set a precedent to allow and strengthen planning justification for future by-law exemption requests. I am also concerned about the lack of servicing information provided considering a bathroom that presumably will have plumbing and be connected to sanitary is proposed in the cabana.

Thank you,  
Irene Ford











