

Shannon Larocque

From: Barbara Wiens
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 12:43 PM
To: Shannon Larocque
Subject: FW: 1145 PELHAM STREET REZONING AMENDMENT

Fyi.....



Barbara Wiens, MCIP, RPP
Director, Community Planning and Development
Town of Pelham
D: 905-980-6658 | E: bwuens@pelham.ca
T: 905-892-2607 x316
20 Pelham Town Square | PO Box 400 | Fonthill, ON | L0S 1E0

TOWN OF PELHAM CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information contained in this communication, including any attachments, may be confidential and is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender and permanently delete the original and any copy of it from your computer system. Thank you.

From: Glen and Ronda Ireland [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 12:21 PM
To: Bob Hildebrandt <BHildebrandt@pelham.ca>; Shellee Niznik <SNiznik@pelham.ca>; John Wink <JWink@pelham.ca>; Brian Eckhardt <BEckhardt@pelham.ca>; Wayne Olson <WOlson@pelham.ca>; Marvin Junkin <MJunkin@pelham.ca>; Kevin Ker <KKer@pelham.ca>; diana.huson@niagararegion.ca; Barbara Wiens <BWuens@pelham.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED] Glen and Ronda Ireland [REDACTED]
Subject: 1145 PELHAM STREET REZONING AMENDMENT

Hello,

As a neighbouring property owner of the proposed 5 story apartment building to be located at 1145 Pelham Street I have concerns.

Pelham was founded and developed on agriculture and green space yet green space is now a low priority in Pelham and in Ontario.

I feel it's necessary to voice my objection to the Upper Canada Consultants application for 1145 Pelham Street Multiple 2 RM2 Zone. In general, I find the applicant's Planning Consultant, Upper Canada Consultants proposal barely holds to minimum provision/requirements and I fear the end result will be a concrete tower sitting on a pile of asphalt that would depreciate the legacy the single family homeowners have today and plan for the future.

Below are points of concern:

1. Minimum Front Yard - Provision states 1/2 building height or 7.5m whichever is greater. A blurry diagram received reflects 6.03 m which doesn't appear to meet requirement of RM2. Being this proposed property will be amongst residential single family homes and located on a dangerously busy

road, a building this size needs to be further off the road allowing for single family homeowners to maintain their legacy and provide safe viewing of traffic patterns. Also, a small plot of grass in front yard will die from winter salting and gravel debri and in the end poor curb appeal.

2. Minimum Landscape - There is minimal landscape for this large building and would be a disgrace to a town founded on green space.
3. Amenity Area - Provision states amenity area for recreation be provided. This developer is providing 'small' area on 5th floor and a small patio on roof top as the amenity / rec area for 42 units. Not enough amenities for a "luxury" claim and \$800 sq/ft rent.
4. Parking - 70 parking spots in total. Diagram shows all parking spots border single family property lines. It would be safer and considerate if some parking were spread to opposite side of building where commercial businesses exist. *Additionally, a single access to such a large parking lot could be traumatic.* There's currently so much traffic "racing" on Pelham St. the vibration not only feels like a race track but noise so excessive it sounds like a race track, in summertime we shout to one another to be heard or don't attempt to try to talk over the racing motors. It would be safer and considerate if some parking were spread to opposite side of building where commercial businesses exist and add another access opening. I was told a single entrance to proposed parking lot, and congregated East and South parking, is due to a Town crosswalk planned for the West side of the proposed building. The crosswalk is planned to cater to the residents behind 1145 Pelham St property so they can access a park on Spruceside.

PLEASE TELL ME A PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALK NOT LOCATED AT AN INTERSECTION IS GOING TO TAKE PRIORITY OVER TWO POINTS OF ACCESS TO A LARGE APARTMENT BUILDING AND ROAD SAFETY ON ONE OF THE BUSIEST ROADS IN FONTHILL.

5. Luxury residential apartment claim -- luxury buildings provide amenities and spacious units, not 400 - 600 sq foot dwellings with a price tag of \$800/sq. Currently waterfront in Grimsby is renting for \$1,800 (one bedroom) - \$2,600 (2 bedroom) and include underground parking, a gym, a pool and a restaurant on site. The rent tag for the proposed apartments is simply ludicrous and a sign of greed. With virtually no employment in town and commuter routes inconvenient, who is the prospective clientele? Given the benefit of doubt, let's look out 10-15 years when the baby boom population fades and GTA commuters find it's too expensive and congested to commute at all, is this when we have vacancy and for sale signs posted on every corner of Town?

Based on the conflicts that exist between space allotted and space planned, my recommendation is NOT to rezone as RM2 at 1145 Pelham Street.

My hope is to preserve the beauty Pelham was founded on and maintain safe roads, at same time, set precedence for future growth that benefits everyone in our community today and in the future.

Ronda Ireland

■ Spruceside Crescent
Fonthill