

Re: Zoning hearing today - HM/A-24:38

Rowena Muhic-Day <muhicday@gmail.com>

Tue 3/12/2024 10:34 AM

To:Committee of adjustment <cofa@hamilton.ca>


 1 attachments (6 KB)

image.png;

Oh, thanks for the update! So, our objection will be filed for the rescheduled meeting, or should I resubmit?

On Tue, Mar 12, 2024, 10:30 a.m. Committee of adjustment <cofa@hamilton.ca> wrote:

Hello,

The Committee of Adjustments hearing for March 12th has been cancelled due to technical issues.

All the best,

Corrine Kabel (she/her)

Development Clerk

Development Planning

Planning and Economic Development, City of Hamilton

905-546-2424 ext.4221



From: Rowena Muhic-Day <muhicday@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 1:13 PM

To: Committee of adjustment <cofa@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Zoning hearing today - HM/A-24:38

Dear Committee of Adjustment Office,

My husband and I live next door to 22 Incnchbury St, which is the subject of a hearing today. We wrote an objection to one of the proposed variances, which is that a new addition be allowed to be built directly on our property line with no setback, but unfortunately realized when we were about to send it yesterday afternoon, that we had missed the submission deadline for written submissions, and the one for presenting in person. Of course, we were incredibly frustrated and annoyed with ourselves for having done this.

I do not know if there is still any way for our opposition to this variance to still be registered? I called to ask this morning but was unable to get through because of the phone problem at City Hall. In any case we do plan on attending the meeting this afternoon.

I have included the statement we wrote below. Many thanks for any help or information you can give me.

Best wishes,
Rowena Muhic-Day.

Reference File: HM/A-24:38

Property in Question: 22 Inchbury Street

We are the owners of the next door property at 18 Inchbury street. We are not opposed to most of the proposed changes, including a 2 story addition to the existing structure and the building of an additional structure near the back of the property. Nor do we oppose an extension of the existing structure to the South-East so long as the typical setback distances are applied. We desire that the existing restrictions in regard to setback distances be applied to any future construction/renovation and oppose any further encroachment toward the property line that we share. We hold three specific concerns:

Firstly, we are concerned that if the proposed structure were allowed to be built closer to the property line, that this would limit future options to develop our property. We are currently considering various options for future development as well. If the setback distance is reduced for our neighbors, we might incur additional expenses in the types of materials required for construction (i.e fire resistant materials), or have restrictions placed on us with regard to the placement of windows, etc, because the limiting distances had now been reduced by our neighbor's renovation. One might rightly expect opposition if we or other future owners were permitted to similarly build to the property line, effectively bringing our neighboring structures against each other. We simply request that the current setback requirements be applied equally.

Secondly, being on the downwind side of the 13 storey building that is situated across the street, we often experience large snow deposits which drift against the front of our driveway and yard. We are concerned that if the neighboring property were to increase to two storeys **and** further encroach the property line, that it would create more of a wind tunnel, and/or reduce areas for snow, snowmelt and rain to settle and dissipate. As the rear of the neighboring structure is currently set back from the property line, there is a natural place for water and snow to fall from the sloped roof of the neighbor's building without landing directly on our paved driveway. If the structure was allowed to move closer to the property line this space would be eliminated and snow or water would fall and flow onto our property, further complicating its removal and increasing the risk of water infiltration into our home.

Finally, if the neighboring property were allowed to increase to two stories **and** further encroach toward the property line it would block all sunlight on that side of our house for significant portions of the day. Our driveway would start to resemble a darkened alley. Maintaining the normal distance from the property line would help to mitigate this effect. Once again, we are not opposed to the increase to two storeys, only any encroachment toward the property line, since this would have a noticeable negative impact on our enjoyment of our own property.

We merely seek that the existing codes and restrictions be applied to this new construction/renovation. The current owners of 22 Inchbury Street have been exemplary neighbors, with whom we have had good relations. We have no wish to enter into a dispute with them, but we are so concerned about the impact of the proposed encroachment that have to register our opposition.

Sincerely,

Submitted By:

George & Rowena Muhic-Day,
18 Inchbury Street,
Hamilton, ON,
L8R 3B3,
muhicday@gmail.com

Minor Variance Application No. HM/A-24:38

Chris Katotikidis <chris.katotikidis@gmail.com>

Fri 3/8/2024 3:46 PM

To:Committee of adjustment <cofa@hamilton.ca>

Please be advised that I have some concerns with this application. The design of the proposed dwelling is intentional design without following the required guidelines set City of Hamilton. Please note that I am opposed to allowing these selfish requests. I am not against the implementation of a secondary dwelling. An architect designs a dwelling based on the existing criteria and could work their design based on the site conditions and city regulations.

Please contact me to confirm that I would attend the meeting in person or by phone. Any questions please contact me.

Christos Katotikidis Cell: 905 339-4874.

Thanks...ChrisK

HM/A-24:38, Hearing March 26th, 2024

Rowena Muhic-Day <muhicday@gmail.com>

Fri 3/22/2024 10:20 AM

To:Committee of adjustment <cofa@hamilton.ca>

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Dear Committee of Adjustment,

Reference File: HM/A-24:38**Property in Question: 22 Inchbury Street****Objection to proposed variance concerning addition to single family dwelling: A minimum side yard setback of 0.0 metres shall be permitted instead of the minimum required 1.2 metres.**

We are the owners of the next door property at 18 Inchbury street. We are not opposed to most of the proposed changes, including a 2-story addition to the existing structure and the building of an additional structure near the back of the property. Nor do we oppose an extension of the existing structure to the South-East so long as the typical setback distances are applied. We desire that the existing restrictions in regard to side-yard setback distances be applied to any future construction/renovation and oppose any further encroachment toward the property line that we share. We hold three specific concerns:

Firstly, we are concerned that if the proposed structure were allowed to be built on the property line, it would limit future options to develop our own property. We are currently considering various options for future development as well. If the setback distance is reduced for our neighbors, we might incur additional expenses in the types of materials required for construction (e.g. fire resistant materials), or have restrictions placed on us with regard to the placement of windows, etc, because the limiting distances had now been reduced by our neighbour's renovation. One might rightly expect opposition if we or other future owners were permitted to similarly build to the property line, effectively bringing our neighboring structures against each other. We simply request that the current setback requirements be applied equally.

Secondly, being on the downwind side of the 13 storey building that is situated across the street, we often experience large snow deposits which drift against the front of our driveway and yard. We are concerned that if the neighboring property were to increase to two storeys **and** further encroach the property line, that it would create more of a wind tunnel, and/or reduce areas for snow, snowmelt and rain to settle and dissipate. As the rear of the neighbouring structure is currently set back from the property line, there is a natural place for water and snow to fall from the sloped roof of the neighbour's building without landing directly on our paved driveway. If the structure was allowed to move closer to the property line this space would be eliminated and snow or water would fall and flow onto our property, further complicating its removal and increasing the risk of water infiltration into our home.

Finally, if the neighbouring property were allowed to increase to two stories **and** further encroach toward the property line it would block all sunlight on that side of our house for significant portions of the day. Maintaining the normal distance from the property line would help to mitigate this effect. Once again, we

are not opposed to the increase to two storeys, only any encroachment toward the property line, since this would have a noticeable negative impact on our enjoyment of our own property.

We only request that the existing codes and restrictions be applied to this new construction/renovation. The current owners of 22 Inchbury Street have been exemplary neighbors, with whom we have had good relations. We do not wish to cause them problems, but we are so concerned about the impact of the proposed encroachment that we have to register our opposition.

Submitted By:

George and Rowena Muhic-Day,
18 Inchbury Street,
Hamilton, ON,
L8R 3B3,
muhicday@gmail.com