

Sarah Leach

To: john janssen; clerks pelham
Subject: RE: Committee of Adjustments File Number: A14/2022P

From: john janssen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 7:08 AM
To: clerks pelham <clerks@pelham.ca>
Subject: Committee of Adjustments File Number: A14/2022P

18-Oct-2022

Secretary Treasurer
Committee of Adjustments
Town of Pelham
20 Pelham Town Square, P.O. Box 400
Fonthill, ON, L0S 1E0

Re: File Number: A14/2022P
14 Wellington Court, Pelham, ON

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing you pursuant to your request for written comments contained in the Notice of Public Hearing for an application for minor variance concerning an addition being built at 14 Wellington Court in the Town of Pelham, Ontario. My wife and I are opposed to the application for variance. There are several reasons we oppose the application and I have summarized them below;

1. The area in question concerns a block of townhomes built in the late 1990's. The development was purposefully built in a manner that achieves a level of consistency from unit to unit. Allowing an extension of the size proposed will have a detrimental affect on the aesthetic of the townhome development.
2. The townhome development already consists of small yard spaces and allowing this proposed addition will further erode the available green space within the development. Eliminating green space is counterintuitive to the townhome development which already puts units in a compact living environment by nature of its design.
3. The proposed variance will expose rear yard neighbours to an increase in both noise and light pollution. Extending the dwelling unit to within 13 feet of the rear property line reduces the space necessary to buffer neighbours from increased noise and light from the unit.
4. If this variance is allowed a precedent will be set which can be used by future homeowners to add additions of such size to their unit whose net affect will be to eliminate a significant amount of green space within the development. This is an unacceptable proposition for owners with units in the development.
5. if such a precedent is set, property values can be negatively affected. The wall of the building will be too close to the rear property line reducing the marketability of units. This will be compounded should additional units make application for and receive approval to proceed with such additions.

Furthermore, at the time when my wife and I purchased our unit our lawyer made us aware of restrictions that were attached to the title for the property. Our understanding is that the restrictions include, but are not limited to "Absolutely no buildings, erections, additions, extensions or attachments of any type or description shall be permitted to any part of or extend beyond any part of the wall of the buildings; save and except that patios and/or decks shall be permitted to or at the rear wall of the buildings."

Lastly, a reduction of the 25ft rear yard requirement contained in Pelham Zoning By-Law 1136(1987) by almost 50% is inappropriate for this townhome development. Frankly, while I am sure it likely meets the Town's definition of a minor variance, it does not appear to be minor at all to us.

Sincerely,

Lauren and John Janssen

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.