

**From:** [Nancy Bozzato](#)  
**To:** [Holly Willford](#); [Curtis Thompson](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: 20 Alan Cres - Application for Bylaw Variances  
**Date:** Thursday, January 2, 2020 3:27:10 PM

---

Dear Ellie;

We will add this correspondence to the Committee of Adjustment agenda for their consideration on these files and we will provide you with a copy of the Notice of Decision when rendered by the committee.

You are also welcome to attend the meeting.

Best regards,  
Nancy

---

**From:** Michael Stefaniuk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 2, 2020 3:14 PM  
**To:** Nancy Bozzato <NBozzato@pelham.ca>  
**Subject:** 20 Alan Cres - Application for Bylaw Variances

Dear Town of Pelham Committee of Adjustment,

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

I am a long time resident of Fonthill, and spent all of my growing up years at 14 Alan Crescent, just down the street from the property in question. I continue to be a resident of Fonthill and feel it necessary to express my opinions regarding this application for variance. I was quite surprised to actually hear of the variances requested in detail. My first reaction was quite an emotional one, but I fully understand the necessity for objectivity in this matter. It seems as though the application is requesting several variances:

1. reduced minimum lot area
2. reduced minimum lot frontage
3. increased maximum lot coverage
4. reduced minimum front yard
5. reduced interior side yard
6. reduced rear yard

Now, we could argue that each one of those individually is a MAJOR variance,

enough reason to question the appropriateness of this application. But who decides what is minor and what is major? However, when you put of of these requests for variances together, it surely is a MAJOR change to the original intention of the by-law. To me, it is akin to stuffing size 10 feet into shoes many sizes too small, shoe-horning a house into the already small back yard of an existing property.

And that is where the biggest problem lies. This request to change the existing by-law in so many ways completely goes against the original planning and character of this neighbourhood. It is a neighbourhood full of beautiful 50s, 60s and 70s homes. Homes that are generally one story homes built on spacious lots. Large mature trees allowed to grow because of that very intent to create a certain feeling and look so many years back. A feeling and a look that has been kept that way and enjoyed and treasured by residents throughout the years. Shoe-horning a small home into an already small backyard is opposite to what the feel of the neighbourhood is now and has been since its inception. It goes against the natural beauty and spaciousness that the original by-law was surely written intending to uphold. If the changes to the by-law go through, what potential changes could then be made by developers looking to squeeze homes in into every spare nook and cranny? How could the original character and feel of this neighbourhood be upheld then?

Long time residents of this subdivision, more recent residents and potential buyers all gravitate to such a neighbourhood because of its existing feel. The non-crowded homes, spacious lots, mature trees, room for their kids to run and play and throw a ball around in the front, back and side yards. They live here because they get a subdivision feeling without the crowdedness of so many of the newer neighbourhoods. When they look out their windows, they don't see the horrible sight of a wall of the nextdoor home built too close. They see a spacious lot and gardens. Room to move around.

Certainly, there have been areas zoned in Fonthill for intensification. Where homes are packed in as close as possible. This is not one of those areas. Why open the door for that to happen? Why allow changes to the very character of such a treasure neighbourhood? You would be devastating those who now live there, you would be changing the character of the area, you would be turning off potential buyers who are confused by the lack of a homogenous context of homes and yards. A mid-century neighbourhood should hold on to its feel.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion in your analysis of the application.

Regards,  
Ellie Stefaniuk  
█ Meadowvale Drive, Fonthill, L0S 1E4  
formerly of █ Alan Crescent, Fonthill

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Sent from [Outlook](#)