

Dear Town of Pelham Committee of Adjustment:

I am writing about the application for minor variances of Bylaws for the property at 20 Alan Crescent, File A29/2019P.

This home was built for my parents after their marriage and became my childhood home. The Black family enjoyed living in Fonthill as a close-knit community. We played with everyone in the neighbourhood and we ran around the yards from one house to the other. It was a wonderful experience.

The so-called "**minor**" variances requested by the owner are actually quite "**MAJOR**". Using Google Earth I tried to envision how the two properties would fit and it is difficult to fathom. My father mentioned that weeping tile was put beside the garage and it looks like the plan would disrupt that space. How will the drainage plan for the new property affect all the neighbours?

The Bylaws were put into place as a precaution to maintaining the beautification of the neighborhood and ignoring them would be contrary to what the town stands for. From the Town of Pelham website: "The Community Beautification Committee was formed to inspire residents and property owners in the Town of Pelham to enhance the visual appeal of their neighbourhoods and public spaces through the creative use of plants and landscaping with an overall respect to environmental stewardship."

The plan to eliminate the garden yard of 20 Alan Crescent is contrary to the above policy idea. Our garden was not very large and a building would totally eliminate any greenery.

"The proposed lot will be 267.18 m<sup>2</sup> smaller than required. The proposed lot will be deficient by 4.8 m (15.7 feet). The maximum lot coverage of 30 % is exceeded by 15% (to 45%)". A lot that is less than two-thirds of the bylaw size is a **major variance**. A lot that is three-quarters of the bylaw frontage is a **major variance**. Less than four feet at the side of the building is a **major variance**. The application is asking for too much: reduced minimum lot area; reduced minimum lot frontage; increased maximum lot coverage; reduced minimum front yard; reduced interior side yard; and continues for part 2 reduced minimum front yard; reduced minimum interior side yard; reduced rear yard.

"If approved, the consent will facilitate the development of an additional single detached dwelling. This housing type is predominant in this area of Fonthill and is the only type permitted under the R1 Zone of the Town of Pelham Zoning By-law." However if there is consent, **neither of the two properties will actually still abide by the R1 Zoning measurement requirements.**

"The concurrent applications propose to facilitate the creation of a new urban lot within an established residential neighbourhood on an underutilized parcel of land". A backyard should not be considered as an underutilization but rather as a beautification asset.

"The introduction of one additional dwelling is considered to have no significant impact on the character of density of the neighbourhood. The parcel will provide ample room for landscaping and amenity area." The "ample room" is definitely misleading. The density may not be impacted but the character of the neighbourhood will be. Four properties will be directly impacted by a new structure in the designated space, which is presently a green space. Actually many properties will be impacted, including the original residence and all the houses on the other side of Alan Crescent which have views of no. 20.

A minimum interior side yard 1.8 m. (5.9ft) down to 1.2m (3.9ft) may be "consistent with more modern zoning" but this neighbourhood established in the mid-50s is not a modern zoning area!!! From a minimum exterior side yard 5m (16.4ft) to "there is no exterior side yard for the proposed lot" is quite a **drastic variance** to the bylaw. "The minimum rear yard is 7.5m and the existing dwelling will have a deficient rear yard setback (6.48)". But that is by proposing that the property is not facing Alan Crescent; i.e. the side yard becomes the rear yard. Of course that is to change the rear setback from the present garage which would be another incredibly **major variance**.

This application does not request a few minor variances; synonyms for minor are " incidental, inconsequential, inconsiderable, insignificant, little, negligible, slight, small, trivial, unimportant".

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion in your analysis of the application. I hope to hear of the refusal for File A29/2019P.

Kerry Black

formerly of

20 Alan Crescent, Fonthill, ON L0S 1E0

presently at [REDACTED] Mill Road, Etobicoke, ON M9C 4W7