To the Committee of Adjustments,

I am submitting additional information for your consideration, that may be helpful for clarification.

Concerning the sea can and the wooden shed,

We plan to sell the sea can, but understand that at this time, it must be considered as a part of our application. There is only one exit by which we can remove it from the lot. If we move the woodshed forward, as called for, that exit will then be blocked. The wooden shed functions as a needed space to store gardening and landscaping items. We have a large lot to maintain.

Concerning the west side elevated deck,

Three 28 inch Big Foot footing forms were used along with ABS tubing placed below the frost line to support the deck. To remove them and replace them would be difficult in such a small amount of space. There may be new code related issues that would further complicate trying to reduce its size.

Included here is a letter signed by the owner of the adjacent property to indicate that they have no issue with the infringement.

Although we were told the letter is meaningless, we think it holds some value for your consideration. The issue with the retaining wall has not been mentioned again by the town.

town. Please note on July 9/18 Bigfoot for docks were Concerning the east side infringement, accepted where located without an issue.

The neighbour's shed, now a part of the fence between us, was allowed to remain there by the town, when their house was rebuilt. We gave our consent that was requested without any qualms. \*\subseteq \omega \code n \shed \text{two} \text{brull m 1993 and falls} into the ontario code - statates of limitations (a 2 year time The town acquired a portion of our land on the north side. Though we did not get any limitations of compensation, we complied and did not protest.

I mention these things to point out the goodwill we applied in each circumstance.

Yours Respectively.

Ann and Jacob Karel

\* wood shed has been there since 1993 without issue.