Lindsay King

Good morning,
I am writing as the owner of 57 Chatham St owned by Cobblestone Appraisals Inc, which is directly adjacent to the subject property requesting the variance. Please advise if we also need to attend the hearing or if our written comments suffice.

We have some concerns regarding the proposal:

1) Section 9.3.2.1.11.2 - how is 308 sq m vs the allows 110 sq m a minor variance - this is almost 3x the allowed size? This is not a conversion of a residential building but a conversion of a commercial building in the commercial core and the committee should be applying the by laws as written. Clearly there is a major size discrepancy and this needs to be reviewed to either update the by law if its intended purpose is for this scale of re development or to apply the appropriate by law. My sense is this is a larger scale re development that needs to be evaluated as a large scale re development not a small scale residential conversion.
2) Parking - we have had issues with the adjacent property parking right up against our building and even hitting it with vehicles nosing up to and over the property line. The parking area is VERY small and there needs to be an appropriate set back from our property line so that we can access this side of our building and to avoid damages. As this building would now have residential use there would be traffic after business hours so we are also concerned about noise and lights shining into the bedrooms which are facing the parking lot. This might include parking bollards / barriers etc. with appropriate set back to protect our building.
3) Snow Removal / Storage - we have had issued with the adjacent property related to snow plowing and storage. In the past the prior owner has plowed snow up against our building damaging the foundation, bricks and our garage. They have also pushed snow up against the south fence adjacent to BRREA parking lot and against our garage. The application needs to consider where snow is going to be plowed and stored as it cannot be pushed against our building causing further damage. Having no green space 4) does not help this situation.
4) Section 9.3.2.1.8 - the request is not a minor variance - the request is 50% of the minimum required. Where will the residents take animals, kids to play, green space, where will #3 snow be stored with no green space? This is an institutional property with high lot coverage. With heavy rains etc. we need to minimize hard scaping. Maybe some of the parking area needs to be converted to green space to accommodate. We believe staff should be looking at all options to convert hard scaped areas as this is NOT a minor variance.
5) Injection Needle Drop Off - note there is a needle drop off box on the south fence in the corner of my property and BRREA which should be addressed - either to remove/relocate or address on the plans.

It appears that something is not lining up with this application as the lot coverage and the size of the conversion are clearly mis aligned with the current by laws. These are not minor variances and should be further evaluated to

determine alternatives to get them aligned to the actual by law. Or the by law needs to be updated but to call these a minor variance is mis leading.

As noted above we have site specific concerns regarding parking and snow removal/storage which have damaged our building and any conversion needs to address.

We wish to be advised as to any decisions and further next steps for this proposal as we are directly impacted.

Thank you
Matthias

Matthias Schmidt███████████████
██████
████████████████████████
███████████

Mobile:█████████████
Email:████████████████████████████████████
Website:████████████████████████████