

From: [Nancy Bozzato](#)
To: [REDACTED]; [John Wink](#); [Holly Willford](#); [Curtis Thompson](#)
Subject: RE: objection to files a28/2019 and file a28/2019p.....
Date: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 9:20:19 AM

Dear Mr. Marando;

Thank you for submitting comments relating to these applications. Your correspondence will be added to the Committee hearing agenda for consideration by the Committee of Adjustment during their deliberations on the applications. We will also provide you with a copy of the Notice of Decision.

I am uncertain as to why the email did not initially come through, so thank you for the follow-up.

Best regards,
Nancy Bozzato

From: John Wink
Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 8:55 AM
To: Nancy Bozzato <NBozzato@pelham.ca>
Subject: Fwd: objection to files a28/2019 and file a28/2019p.....

Hi Nancy,
Apparently Jim Morrando tried to send this to you but it was rejected. This is his comments regarding the COA meeting on Jan 14.
John

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: jim marando [REDACTED] >
Date: January 7, 2020 at 8:51:33 PM EST
To: "jwink@pelham.ca" <jwink@pelham.ca>
Subject: objection to files a28/2019 and file a28/2019p.....

hi john i attempted to send this off to the clerk ms. bozzato but it was rejected so i am sending this off to you hello ms. bozzatoi am requesting an extension as noted via my last emaili along with many of our neighbors on elizabeth drive and highland ave. feel to compelled to object to this proposal for the following reasons ..8 variances lumped together do not constitute one minor variance...this is an r1 property for over 44 years that i can attest tothe front yard does not conform to the zoning bylawthe 3 too small side yard setbacks do not conform to the bylaw.....the length of the proposed front yard is not long enough for a car park.... the lot square footage is undersized per bylawthe lot

coverage of the proposed building is too great as per the bylawdon't know whether a 1 ,1 1/2 or 2 storey is proposed....feel strongly that approving any or all of the variances would set a precedent detrimental to this neighbourhood and others..as i look out from my yard i can see 4 to5 potential lot creationsthis is an established and mature neighborhood should not be compared to so many of the current sardine can developmentsthat this list of variances are not minorthere is a valid zoning bylaw so just enforce the bylawthe time of 4 o'clock for the hearing though it works for me.... many neighbours have to make special arrangements just to attend ...that this type of variance affects the entire neighbourhood and not those just within 200 ' which is far too tiny a distance (this minimal distance in an area with 100' lots works for building a deck or storage shed) not this type of area.....everyone on the street affected should be contacted and given the opportunity to comment ...the general intent of the zoning bylaw is not being maintained...the official plan has no provision for cutting up existing single family lots to create infill lotsyellow signs erected should clearly list all the variances without having to research the bylawsas i have said many times before " just enforce the bylaw"recommend all existing vacant /infill lots be identified before any new zoning bylaw is developedand formulate a plan to deal with them in the futurethe great burden being placed on the committee of adjustments to deal with this type of lot creation/severance from back, side or front yards of existing residences in longstanding neighborhoods should be not fall under this process.....council should be the judge and jury deal with such proposals that would create a precedenturge the committee to pass this on to city council.....again john i am sending this to you as the my message wasn't delivered because the destination email rejected it for policy or security reasons??????.....jim marando [REDACTED] highland ave [REDACTED]