
January 4, 2020

To the Committee of Adjustment;

From Ted and Angeline Galotta

■ Alan Crescent, ■

Regarding File: B11/2019P; A28/2019P; A29/2019P. 20 Alan Crescent

We have just recently become aware of the January 14 meeting. Thank you for allowing us an extension from Jan. 02 until Jan. 08 to submit our letter of objection.

We are residents at ■ Alan Crescent, down the street from 20 Alan Crescent and want to comment and register our opposition to the approval for said variances.

We are in total agreement with the neighbours immediately adjacent to 20 Alan, namely Foster Zanutto (■ Alan), Rob Jensen (■ Highland) and Roger & Peggy Barnsley (■ Highland). In the letters they have sent to the Committee of Adjustment.

We respectfully ask the Committee of Adjustment to deny all the requested variances and adhere to bylaw 1136.

We have concerns on the following issues.

How it would negatively impact the immediate neighbours and alter the character of the whole neighbourhood.

How it could set a precedent for severances of other similar properties which would lead to a degradation of the neighbourhood and change the town.

It would add to traffic mishaps due to the increased likelihood of street parking on a busy thoroughfare that has no sidewalks.

The new owner of 20 Alan looks to the Provincial Policy Statement to support his request to sever the property. I will use the same Policy Statement and give reasons why the property should NOT be severed.

Sections in red are from the Provincial Policy Statement. I follow this by addressing the negative impact the re-development of 20 Alan will have in an **environmental, economic** and **social** way on our neighbourhood.

Part III: How to read the Provincial Policy Statement

The provincial policy-led planning system recognizes and addresses the complex inter-relationships among **environmental, economic** and **social factors** in land use planning. The Provincial Policy Statement supports a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach to planning, and recognizes linkages among policy areas.

(1) Are there any environmental benefits to this proposed project?

In our opinion there are NO environmental benefits to redevelop 20 Alan Cres. But there are definitely negative environmental impacts by taking large, established, treed, properties, out of neighbourhoods.

On the topic of large trees & biodiversity.

We reference **PPS 1.1.1h** which says that 'Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity and consider the impacts of climate change.'

And also **PPS 1.7.1J**, which advances 'Long term economic prosperity by minimizing negative impacts from a changing climate and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature'

And also **PPS 1.8.1g** which speaks of **Energy conservation, air quality and climate change by maximizing vegetation within settlement areas, where feasible.**

In short, the above references say that, nature and biodiversity of vegetation help with human health, helps economy, helps fight climate change and is recommended.

The larger lots in our neighbourhood allow for more tree planting because the space allows it. More tree planting leads to greater biodiversity, as each neighbour selects different species that they have a preference for.

Oak, walnut, beech, tulip, maple, mulberry, cherry, magnolia, apple, peach, redbud, pawpaw, pines, spruce, tall cedars, nootka cypress.

All the above are mature trees found on either our own (5 Alan Cres) property or the three properties that abut ours (either side and behind). This does not include the town trees. And are just an example of the diversity that can be had on just 4 properties. The neighbourhood as a whole has many many more.

The larger lots of Fonthill offer a wealth of trees that are all tended by the homeowners. All contributing to an environmental treasure for the town.

Small lots produce NO large trees because there is NO room, and certainly NO biodiversity.

In addition, we should not depend on the town's street trees as our only source of large trees. If we do, then we would be poorer for it, and definitely lack the biodiversity.

A recent article said that 36 million trees are removed from urban & rural communities in the United States annually. It went on to say that "if we continue on this path cities will become warmer, more polluted and generally more unhealthy for inhabitants" said David Nowak, a senior US Forest Service scientist.

Even if you reduce this 36 million number by 1/10 (given the population difference between Canada and the U.S.) the number is significant. Fonthill is blessed with soil in which large trees thrive. The environment should be a main consideration for property development.

(2) Are there any economic benefits to this proposed project?

I can see no significant economic benefits, except for the short-term limited dollars made by the developer. I would argue that if this proposed project goes through it opens the door to other such severances and the town loses more of its uniqueness and character. Becoming at best'ordinary', and certainly a less desirable place to live and raise a family.

Fonthill is known for its character. Even down to its variety in home styles. We don't tend to have the 'cookie cutter' homes especially in the older sections. **PPS 1.7 d. states that 'Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character,'**

Additionally, the property owners in the immediate vicinity of this project will most certainly suffer negative economic impacts in the form of decreased property value and resale desirability, and of course loss of enjoyment of their own property.

(3) Are there any social benefits to this proposed project?

Part IV: Vision for Ontario's land use planning system

The long-term prosperity and social well-being of Ontario depends upon planning for strong, sustainable and resilient communities for people of all ages, a clean and healthy environment, and a strong and competitive economy.

Strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and a strong economy are inextricably linked. Long-term prosperity, human and environmental health and social well-being should take precedence over short-term considerations.

Families are the core of our society and the Alan Crescent / Elizabeth Drive neighborhood is extremely successful at being conducive to family living. None of the properties should be severed into postage stamp size lots.

Here on Alan Crescent is a place where families are raised, children have a decent size yard to play in, and parents continue to live in the home for as long as they can, after the children have grown. This ability to stay in their home is afforded to them because many are bungalows, which gives them one floor living.

There are only 16 houses on Alan Crescent. Three of those are currently owned by people who grew up in the home as children, are now adults, and after their parents passed away, they moved back to live in the home themselves. And in a fourth case it is a grandchild of the original owner that lives in that home. (that makes it 4 of 16 homes).

That is why I say Alan Crescent is extremely conducive to family living and all properties should be maintained, in their present form. Truly a neighbourhood suited for all ages.

Additional reasons to deny the request for variances.

4.0 Implementation and interpretation

4.8 Zoning and development permit by-laws are important for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement. Planning authorities shall keep their zoning and development permit by-laws up to date with their official plans and this Provincial Policy Statement.

The zone bylaws and development permits laws are the current ones. The owner/developer of 20 Alan must work within those specifications and not request exemption from the laws in order to create homes that he wants and that are completely out of character with the neighbourhood. These are not minor variances that he is requesting, but major exemptions from the bylaws.

The very fact that so many variances are requested for 20 Alan is a clear indication that this project is not in keeping with the neighbourhood. All neighbours I have spoken to are in clear and united objection to this project.

Increased likelihood of street parking on Elizabeth that could lead to traffic accidents.

Reducing the size of the 20 Alan lot and adding a second dwelling would lead to 'on street parking' for both these dwellings.

Elizabeth St. is a heavily travelled thoroughfare for automobile traffic between Pelham Street and subdivisions beyond the immediate vicinity of Elizabeth & Alan. That being into the Daleview Cres. Daleview Dr. and beyond.

This increases the potential for pedestrian accidents as there are NO sidewalks. People walk quite a bit in this neighbourhood. Walk for pleasure, walk their dogs, walk to downtown, walk to the convenience store.

Increasing the number of households and decreasing the space for them to park their vehicles will lead to more street parking. Especially as the modern family tends to fill their garage with 'stuff', other than their car.

Right now we do not have the problem of street parking. Large lots give people the opportunity of having a decent size shed to store lawnmower, snowblower, and the rest of the 'stuff'.

How our own infill lot, at ■ Alan, was developed in a beneficial way

People that move to Alan Cres. take pride in their home and want to belong to the community.

I will emphasize this with personal comparisons. How we made every attempt to make our own house compliment the others around it.

In our case. At █ Alan Cres. we have an infill lot. New construction built in 1999. It's located behind the Historic Brown House.

The lot was severed from the Brown House in 1990. Sold to Marion Damude. The Damude's did not build. Angeline and I purchased it in 1998. But the story of █ Alan, and what is proposed for 20 Alan could not be further apart.

When planning and designing our home, we had to obviously abide by all the regular bylaws. Plus, we had an additional restrictive covenant registered against the land that was added by the Repchull's, who owned the 'Brown House' years earlier. The Agreement of Purchase and Sale said that 'No building shall be erected having more than one storey. No two-storey building shall be erected'. In essence it said that we could not build a two-storey house on our own property.

We could understand that the clause was important to the Repchull's so that any house built on the lot would integrate well with the neighbourhood in style, and also not dominate over the Brown House.

In addition, the severed lot size was made to be the same size as others on the street. Even though it did not have to be as large. When all the other lots were created in the 1950s and 60's. they had to accommodate septic beds. That was not the case with ours in 1990's. However, the lot we have was made to be similar to all the others, (80 x 155 ft). Again, for the sake of conformity.

To assist in making our bungalow integrate well with the other homes we made specific design choices.

- No east side windows overlook the Brown Homestead property (except two basement windows)
- One of the two mature street trees interfered with the location of our driveway. So, we altered the driveway to accommodate the tree.
- Most of the homes on our street are brick. All around, front and back. Not just brick front and siding it the back. We did the same. Brick all around.
- We chose a lighter shingle colour so the roof would recede and not dominate.

These are just some examples of how we tried to make a modern house fit into an existing neighbourhood.

By severing 20 Alan the opposite would be done. I see the new owner of 20 Alan making choices of personal benefit and disregarding how it will impact his neighbours.

What to do with 20 Alan Crescent?

To the Committee of Adjustments, we register my opposition and respectfully ask that that they deny all the requested variances. For the reasons that we, and all the neighbors have presented to you.

To the owner/builder of 20 Alan Cres. we would encourage him to follow the lead of the owners of █ Alan, 10 Alan, and 11 Elizabeth. All houses that had substantial renovations in very recent years, by their owners. Owners that have older properties but knew they had homes worth putting the money into. Creating better homes for themselves and the town.

Right now, 20 Alan Cres. has the ingredients to make a renovation work, and result in a very desirable home. It is dated, but it is a bungalow that has space inside and out to work with. It has it a double garage, something desired by modern families. Plus, it has great 'location'.

However; if the Proposed Re- Development is permitted to go through the new versions of 20 Alan would be multiple residences, on a corner lot, with no backyards to speak of. When it comes time for the builder to sell 20 Alan, it would be less desirable than a similar property nearby that has good lot size. What it means to the community if this and other similar variances are allowed is loss of character and uniqueness and individuality.

In conclusion:

There are good examples in this town of how redevelopment of land appropriately follows the guidelines of the Provincial Policy Statement and resulted in an increase of the housing supply. The East Fonthill development and the old Fonthill Lumber site are excellent examples of land that is redeveloped in a way

that promotes urban intensification. However, redevelopment of 20 Alan is disruptive and not beneficial to the neighbourhood.

We, the neighbours, choose to live in the type of neighbourhood we have. Just as someone moving to the Fonthill Yards chooses to live in that type of housing.

I have registered our objection. I have tried to convey how Alan Cres. & Elizabeth Drive is a successful neighborhood in its present form. I have given reasons why variances like this should not be given. I have even given an alternative as to what can be done with 20 Alan Cres.

I would hope that the Committee of Adjustment will adhere to the request of the neighbourhood and deny all these variances.

Regards

Ted Galotta

Angeline Galotta