

July 17th, 2019

Curtis Thompson
Planner, Township of Pelham
20 Pelham Town Square
Fonthill, Ontario
L0S 1E0

Re: Lots 2 (241) and 3 (237) Farr Street
Minor Variance application

Curtis,

I am writing this letter with regard to our minor variance applications for both 241 and 237 Farr Street building lots. As you know, we are asking for relief of the current by-law stating that the side yard setbacks for both of these building lots shall be 9 meters.

As you also know, our initial applications for these lots has been revised and our MV date has been pushed to August 13th, 2019. The reason for this re-scheduling was due to the fact that our initial applications packages were incomplete, thus comments from various staff were either negative or inconclusive.

This seemed to be the case with your comments coming from Planning where you advise that 'due to lack of supportive Regional comments' Planning is not in a position to support this minor variance request. Also, through our emails, you mention that based on the lot size and current by-law side yard setbacks, it does not appear that these building lot sizes do not cause undue hardship in the design and building of new homes.

The main reason for today's letter is to voice our thoughts and ideas as to why we feel that these lots were created on a much smaller scale and width than most of the other building lots available in the area, thus they have a much smaller building foot print, which limits the potential home builds to be more narrow and long as opposed to wide and not as deep, which allows more space in the rear yard for septic beds and French drains, etc.

For example, we just applied for a minor variance on lot 1 (245) Farr Street where we were successful in reducing the side yard setbacks from 9m to 4.5m. This again allowed us a wider home, making the rear yard more available for our septic bed. The home we intend to build is 21 meters wide.

Also, we have been building in the Farr Street area for about 5 years now and all of the other homes we have built were a minimum of 24 meters wide. None of the homes were ever within the 12 to 14 meter width that we would currently have to build on 241 and 237 Farr St if our applications were not successful. In fact, most of the new homes being built in the immediate vicinity of our 2 Farr Street lots are all wider than they are narrow. Some examples are 920, 930, 950 and 970 Webber Road.

Due to this, we are just trying to build homes that a) fit into the existing neighbourhood and actually enhance the area, as opposed to building much more narrow homes that do not fit into the area and would raise the eyebrows of current neighbours, and b) build wider homes that allow us to better fit rear yard septic beds and French drains for adequate water drainage.

Lastly, when reading from the Official Plan Policy, section E1.5, there are 4 points they bring up:

- 1) **Conforms with the general intent of the Official Plan.** Our request definitely conforms with the general intent. We are trying to build homes that fit into the current neighbourhood size of homes.
- 2) **Spirit of the intent of the Zoning by-law.** Again, we are just wanting to build single family dwellings, nothing crazy like a 3 storey home.
- 3) **Request is appropriate for the desirable development of the lot.** One way or another, this is a building lot and a home is going to be built on this lot. We feel a wider home allowing for a larger backyard is generally what is already being built on other lots in this area to allow for rear yard septic beds.
- 4) **Request is minor.** We feel the side yard setbacks we are asking for are minor in nature as we are not building a monster home on a small lot, and without any resistance, the same request was just passed on 245 Farr Street.

In summary, the fact is that these are existing lots of record similar to a small estate subdivision, BUT the zoning remains agricultural. This is an unfortunate fact, but it is the reality in which we are trying to function. In the Agricultural zone, the setback requirements are much larger than they generally are for residential zones; in this case 9m for an interior side yard. We are just asking to adjust the side yard setbacks to something more in line with a residential zone that would more accurately reflect the size and shape of these lots and that would fit into the general feel of the area.

I am hoping that this sheds some light in a positive way as to why we are asking for the side yard setbacks on both of these lots to be reduced and supported by yourself and Planning.

