

December 8, 2019

To: Ms. Nancy Bozzato  
Town Clerk/Secretary-Treasurer  
Town of Pelham

From: Peggy and Roger Barnsley  
█ Highland Avenue  
Fonthill, ON

RE: FILE A28/2019P – 20 Alan Crescent, Pelham

---

I'm responding to File A28/2019P regarding 20 Alan Crescent, Pelham. We are the owners of █ Highland Avenue which borders right behind (█) the proposed construction of an additional residential dwelling on the property of 20 Alan Crescent, Pelham. Our back of our house faces the back of 20 Alan Crescent.

To start, I have grown up in Pelham and over the years have seen a growth in areas within the town. Land that was once was farmland, agriculture properties, orchards and double lot properties have been bought and developed. The additional residential housing, commercial establishments, expansions and retirement facilities have benefited our community in providing "in-town" shopping venues, homes for our "life-long" citizens to reside, returning "Pelhamers", and for people who want to reside in the town that was reputable for its uniqueness and small-town community environment.

The land our home is on was once farmland that was severed and sold to accommodate single dwelling homes. These properties were spacious, private and provided growing families enough green space for their children to grow up. It followed the compliance in conjunction with how the small community was built. Yes areas, especially those with double lots, have developed but this area is one that still represents the "mirror" of Pelham. These homes are sought after and envy of others who would love to reside in this area because of the privacy, spacious lots with room for families to enjoy. We bought our house 20 years ago exactly for these reasons. We wanted to raise our children with the safety, security, comfort and the green space of enjoying life without the "closeness" of neighbours sitting on top of us and able to sight everything we did. This neighbourhood gave us that and it was never a thought that one day the town was going to even consider allowing someone to come in and take that away.

This individual, who purchased the residential home behind us (20 Alan Crescent), application is requesting to build an additional dwelling on a lot that was designed and purchased for a single dwelling home. They are not only asking for one but requesting a variance in all by-laws to build on this property. They are also asking that the back of the current house now be deemed the side of the house to avoid any regulations. I'm sorry I don't see this as a minor variance, when asking for a modification to all the town's by-laws set for residential building on a lot, by-laws that were set and voted on when living right behind the planned building it becomes a major variance. You are asking people who have lived in this neighborhood for many years to allow someone, from out of town, to come in and disrupt the development of our neighbourhood that we have lived in. It not only will be an eye sore; it will lower the value of all homes in the area and it will not accommodate with the surrounding dwellings of this neighbourhood.

In neighborhoods and communities across the country, zoning laws dictate the specific type of property that can be built in various locations. Although this may seem restrictive, zoning is a crucial element of city planning that helps ensure communities of all sizes grow in a sustainable and organized manner. When you are planning on purchasing a new home in an area you may be unfamiliar with, taking time to explore and identify zoning regulations in your area could help you catch a glimpse into the future of what your neighborhood will look like and how it will grow over time. Homeowners, families look at this when purchasing a “home”, developers look at the “dollar figures” that it will bring to their wallet.

The R1 Zoning is one of the most commonly found zoning types in residential neighborhoods. This classification allows single-family homes to be built, with one unit intended per lot.

When an area receives a zoning classification from city planners, only the specific types of structures approved by the city can be built in that area. In a neighborhood environment, R1 Zoning helps ensure that the area remains relatively low regarding density and help boosts its appeal for new families.

The Town of Pelham's Zoning Bylaw 1136 (1987) contains detailed information on what kind of land use and physical structures are allowed on each property in the town. The details include items such as the height of buildings, number of metres a building must be set back from the street, and landscaping requirements, etc.

Are we opening the doors for these developers and purchasers to come in and disrupt our community and force long time residential citizens to feel that they are being pushed out of their community that they refer to as our “home”? Allowing this will not only disdain the by-laws that are set in place for our town development, it will make our town’s character depreciate giving the impression that our town is only after the profit that developers bring in no matter what deterioration it brings to the “community environment”. Developers and owners of a property should not be allowed to apply for variances to the by-laws that are set. They should be adhering to these by-laws. Allowing this to happen we are just opening the doors to others to come in and do the same. If you let one others will follow and before you know it the appeal of our small-town community will be diminished.

These people have no intention of residing in the purchase, they are using them to sell and, in this case, rent out the units. They are looking at the dollar profit and not the value of living in “Pelham”. They do not respect the care, pride and passion that we, the people from Pelham take in maintaining our properties and living in Pelham. We all know, and have seen it ourselves, that property owners that have no vested interest in the town but only a monetarily interest do not care for their property or dwelling. They leave it to the renters to maintain their properties and homes and you know how that turns out. Currently the owner has the house rented out and It’s only been a short period and we already had police at the house. Does the owner care, no, they are getting their rent and letting the neighbours and community deal with any deterioration, disruptions and offences that occur with the renters? All about the money to them and we should not allow them to trash our town image.

So why are we even considering this application if they do not meet, not one but all of the stated by-laws? Why are we risking the reputation of our town? Are we a small-town community that is passionate about our neighbourhoods, our environment, our families and our status or are we going to allow developers and new out of town owners take over and turn the "Town of Pelham" into the "City of Pelham"? I'm sure we all know the downfalls of a "City". Being opposed to this application I hope that you consider what is right for the neighbourhood and what keeps "our town our home".

We would like to be notified of the decision of the Committee of Adjustment (Committee) in respect to this application (File A28/2019P).

Thank you for your consideration to our strong thoughts on this proposed development.

Peggy and Roger Barnsley  
Highland Avenue, Fonthill, ON  
[REDACTED]