

**MacPherson, Adriana**

---

**Subject:** FW: [External] Fwd: Minor Variance Application A064/20  
**Attachments:** Request for Decision A064 20.pdf

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Vijay Dhanraj** <[REDACTED]>  
Date: Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 8:21 AM  
Subject: Minor Variance Application A064/20  
To: <[cofa@vaughan.ca](mailto:cofa@vaughan.ca)>

**ADDENDUM**  
**AGENDA ITEM**  
**9**  
**COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

To: City of Vaughan  
Office of the City Clerk - Committee of Adjustment  
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive, Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1  
[cofa@vaughan.ca](mailto:cofa@vaughan.ca)

Good Day,

I am writing to express my concerns about the Notice of Application, Minor Variance Application A064/20 and request that these concerns be brought to the attention of the Committee of Adjustments at the hearing scheduled on October 1, 2020.

I live on Napa Hill Court and I am very concerned about the application from my neighbour at 92 Napa Hill Court, seeking relief from By-law 1-88 to permit construction of a pool and mechanical room/change room.

My concerns are as follows:

1. When we purchased our home on Napa Hill Court from Aspen Ridge in 2000 we paid a premium of \$30,000 to be on a lot backing on the Sugar Bush with the understanding that the city had strict by-laws in place for those lots to prevent addition of large structures in backyards, including height limitations, to avoid negatively impacting the forest and wildlife; as well as, ensuring the quiet enjoyment of residents with houses backing on the forest.
2. The variance from the by-law being requested by the applicant is quite significant. A permit for a 1.0 metre rear yard setback to the pool as per the applicant's request, is less than the minimum rear yard setback for lots on Napa Hill Court that don't back on the woods. Furthermore, the minimum 1.0 metre rear yard setback request by the applicant represents a 87% reduction in the rear yard setback requirements. A 7.5 metre minimum rear yard setback for lots backing on the forest are in place to protect the forest, wildlife and preserve peaceful and quiet enjoyment of the forest by residents. Approval by the City of an exception to a 7.5 metre minimum rear yard setback requirement would be unfair to residents who purchased their homes on Napa Hill Court with that understanding.
3. Our lot sizes on Napa Hill Court are relatively small. In fact, the space between the houses on Napa Hill Court are very narrow. Earlier this year, my immediate neighbour had their shingles replaced; and, three months later, I still have remnants of their old shingles in my backyard and on the window sills of my home. I raise this point, only to illustrate how close together homes on Napa Hill Court are. The lot size of homes on the street are simply not large enough to have a pool without inconveniencing neighbours. Pools in general add to the sound level in the backyard; also, there is increased sound from mechanical equipment associated with the pool. This could also negatively impact the property value of my home.

4. Lastly, it is critical that the Committee of Adjustments make their decision on this minor variance application very carefully as it can be precedent setting in our neighbourhood, where at present there aren't any swimming pools in backyards on Napa Hill Court.

I respectfully request that the City enforce By-law 1-88 to ensure that the forest and wildlife are protected and that homeowners can continue to quietly and peacefully enjoy the forest.

I would like to be notified of the Committee's decision. Please find attached a completed form requesting notification of the Committee's decision.

If you have any questions about my submission, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Vijay Dhanraj,  
74 Napa Hill Court  
Thornhill, Ontario



Sender notified by  
[Mailtrack](#)

