

From: pelham306 [REDACTED]

Date: 2021-02-26 2:00 p.m. (GMT-05:00)

To: Melissa Beckett <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 614 metler rd file # a9/2021p

I am concerned with the variances to the frontage requirements for this property and am hoping it is not approved.

We, North Pelham, are a small Hamblet community. We moved out here for the rural feel. Minimum frontage requirements attempt to keep that feel. Those frontage requirements were previously set by planning and the region to maintain what we have. Alterations to the frontage does not maintain that plan. When the property in question was purchased, the listing stated that variances would be required. So it was understood this was not agreed. There are already threats of executive subdivisions in the community. The density of housing is somehow determined by the frontage requirements. I don't feel a need to adjust this for the prospect of profit and development in our small community.

We do not have the services of the urban centre. I also have concerns over how two more properties, will have demands on the water supply.

We cannot just turn on our taps and get more water. This would be an expensive venture to Redrill wells... deeper at a expensive \$/ft rate to ensure a supply of water for our properties. I have already seen my levels lower in my well based on the higher agriculture demands around me. Are there any assurances my water supply will not be negatively effected by the new properties?

The frontage requirements, to some level ensure a housing density that won't overwhelm our water tables and supplies.

Two new houses will also require new septic beds. A proper housing density works with the region and land for a sustainable system. Again, why jeopardize this system for the ability to adjust the set rules for profit of development.

The last thing I would like to add is that the attempt to split this property into 3 rather than 2, which would fit into the plans with no variances required

Terry and Melissa Beckett

[REDACTED] metler rd