

## Sarah Leach

---

**Cc:** Kenny Ng  
**Subject:** RE: File# A2/2022P, 368 Canboro Rd Pelham PL7 Con8

**From:** John Pruyn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:44 PM  
**To:** Holly Willford <[HWillford@pelham.ca](mailto:HWillford@pelham.ca)>; Cynthia Best [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** File# A2/2022P, 368 Canboro Rd Pelham PL7 Con8

To The Committee of Adjustment:

We are John and Susan Pruyn and we reside at [REDACTED] Canboro Rd. You have notified us that the owners of 368 Canboro Rd want to change the agricultural area of their property into a building lot and construct a large house and garage. The proposed dwelling is west of our property and will be prominently visible from our backyard. Our objections are as follows:

- 1) We are concerned about drainage. The back of our property is low. The new dwelling at the back of 368 Canboro has the potential to cause the surrounding lower properties to be flooded and unusable due to extra water buildup. Water from Canboro Road, runs down our driveway (also our neighbours) and through our back yard like a river, ending up in the field and agricultural areas of 358, 360, 362, 364, 366 and 368. The new dwelling will affect the drainage of the surrounding properties. Our hillside area will likely be subject to heavy rainfalls in the future due to climate change. A condition of the variance should be that there are no impacts on any neighbours' property from current and future drainage issues. We request that a stormwater management report be submitted to the Town showing post development flows do not exceed pre development flows.
- 2) Requesting a side yard of 1.2m when the bylaw requires 9m is not a minor variance and the committee of adjustment can only grant minor variances. This should be an application for site specific rezoning. Minor is defined in the zoning bylaw and the applicant has to show that their request is minor. Asking for 8m instead of 9m is a minor 1m change. Asking for 1.2m instead of 9m is a major 7.8m change and not a minor variance.
- 3) Currently the majority of the property at 368 is available for agricultural use. The proposed dwelling location and driveway will change the property into a suburban property not suitable for an agricultural area. The house will only be 1.2m from the neighbour's agricultural area. Chickens, pigs, cows etc. can be right next to the house. Is it okay to have livestock so close to a dwelling? A condition of the variance should be that there are no impacts on any neighbours' use of their properties for agricultural purposes.

This is a rural area with fields and wooded areas behind the houses along Canboro Road. The request to insert a large house and garage in the middle of prime agricultural land, right against the neighbour's property is not a minor variance and should be rejected.

Yours truly,

John and Susan Pruyn  
[REDACTED] Canboro Rd  
[REDACTED]  
Ridgeville ON L0S 1M0  
[REDACTED]