

General Correspondence:

**Decision Report – Additional Residential Unit Review: Planning Act Update
OPA No. 72 Zoning By-Law Amendment File: 0ZS20-02, 2020 214**

Re this issue, I wish to express the following view:

1. In-fill structures should be restricted as much as possible in size, height and proximity to property lines, specifically limited to a single, one-storey, one-bedroom unit per lot.
 2. The units should be located abutting the property owner's home and at least 3 meters on all sides from fence lines. The property owner is the one profiting from the rental fee, not the neighbours. Hence the owner should be the one to bear any inconvenience of noise, loss of privacy, impeded sightlines and blockage of sunlight.
 3. Infill structures should be allowed only in areas not already clogged with student rentals, such as those close to university. To do so would only exacerbate an on-going problem with parking, noise and other disturbances.
 4. Infilling should also avoid environmentally sensitive areas. I urge the city to bear in mind that forested and wetland areas, for example the area around Preservation Park, Hanlon Creek Park, Crane Park, have been already badly encroached on by development. We all have a duty of conservation toward preserving what remains of our natural environment.
 5. The city should be prepared to increase staffing in appropriate departments in order to deal with the undoubted increase in complaints and issues of compliance.
 6. I understand that infilling is provincially mandated. However, it is within Guelph's power to apply this policy wisely both from the perspectives of creating a balanced community and a healthy natural environment.
- I urge City Council members to give serious consideration to my concerns. I know they are shared by many.

Michelle Wan

Michelle Wan voiced her concerns about this issue and translated exactly my reluctance to your project. The Campus Estates area is already overcrowded by students with its inherent problems of noise, traffic, parking. Covid 19 forced on-line education, with a quieter neighbourhood as a side effect, and might well impact the way knowledge is transmitted in the future. Is it then wise to add buildings harbouring students?

Best regards,
Françoise Py-MacBeth

Please don't do this, Guelph doesn't have the parking for these structures with all the student housing we currently have. An average of 6-8 cars are at each student rental currently.

No is our vote

Faye Hamilton

I would like to voice my support for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law amendments to provide greater opportunities for additional residential units across the city, to be discussed on December 14. As both an urban planner and an owner of a detached house with a legal basement apartment, I think it is long overdue to have policies and regulations that improve the flexibility to introduce additional units in our existing residential areas - whether basement apartments or standalone/accessory structures.

I recall two rules for healthy neighbourhood change from a StrongTowns [article](#) I read earlier this year, that I think should offer some guidance here:

1. No neighbourhood can be exempt from change
2. No neighbourhood should experience sudden, radical change.

Policies and regulations allowing incremental change like this are a perfect example of this idea. They introduce opportunities for greater density and diversity in residents, housing types, and building forms that will strengthen our city and its neighbourhoods, with minimal disruption/impact to existing neighbourhoods/residents. For too long, we have exempted almost all of our existing residential areas from any change beyond a single detached home, often mis-labeling it as radical or sudden change.

I am sure these policies and regulations are not perfect, as few are when initially introduced. However, these changes are the least we can be doing to improve livability and residential availability across the city. I remain optimistic that the Zoning By-Law review, Growth Management Strategy, and upcoming Official Plan review will offer additional policies and regulations to address demand for more homes in our existing built area.

Thank you.

Darren Shock

I am strongly against the proposal for additional backyard houses. In a neighbourhood already overflowing with student rental properties, it would cause even more strain on the permanent residents. My understanding is this is designed to increase affordable housing spots. The absentee landlords that already own a vast majority of property in our neighbourhood, certainly wouldn't offer these dwellings to low-income individuals and families. They would be targeting the university students at very high rental prices. These dwellings should not be allowed in wards 5 or 6.

The other serious concern is the parking, noise issues and property issues from these rental properties. The streets are packed with vehicles day and night. The noise from parties and students walking the streets late at night affect those living full time in the area.

I would hope that the councillors for Ward 5 would have the same concerns and vote against this proposal.

Steve Fleming

First, I understand that one of the Province's objectives in mandating accessory structures is to increase affordable housing for lower income individuals and families. I wish to point out that this plan simply devolves the responsibility onto city residents and private landlords. There is no guarantee that such rentals, if they are built, will be "affordable". Landlords will charge what they can get. In a free enterprise market, how will the city regulate this? Even tracking for data and reporting reasons will be difficult unless you create a registry of such structures. Other cities have licensed accessory buildings. Guelph should seriously consider doing the same.

Second, in a student-dense city like Guelph, and given students' preference for living off campus, students will offer strong competition to lower income tenants for new accessory housing. So unless we consider students among the target population (which I don't think is the intention), here is another obstacle to meeting the provincial objective. All that will be achieved will be more housing for students.

Third, this leads me to the issue of where accessory housing will be allowed. If infilling is allowed in areas surrounding the university, again it will be students tenanted these rentals. Moreover, these areas are already student saturated and intensifying the student population will only add to existing problems and cost to city and taxpayers for policing and by-law enforcement. I believe the University once required first-year students to live on campus but removed this requirement. I would urge Council to strongly encourage the University to reinstate this requirement.

Fourth, I think it would be more supportive of the Province's goal to zone accessory housing in areas near high employment concentration, such as the industrialized northeast part of the city. This would allow workers to live closer to work and reduce travel expenses. I would exclude areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive forests and wetlands, such as Preservation Park, Crane Park, the Ignatius Old Growth Forest, to name a few.

Thank you for your attention and for giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns.

Tim Johnson

We request that this email be included in the package for the council meeting on December 14th, 2020.

We live in a neighbourhood that is 'student-heavy' We submitted concerns some time ago when initial feedback and comments were invited and continue to have significant concerns about recommended changes sent out recently and find them unacceptable.

Students and Affordable Housing: The need for affordable housing is important in the student-heavy neighbourhood we have, the only ones to benefit will be absent landlords who care little about the neighbourhood or the property they rent out and more about profit that the students can provide to them. Issues such as noise, property standards, loud and large gatherings, respect for existing bylaws continue to be an issue and will only be exacerbated further with an influx of additional students in accessory dwellings. Given that the city does not licence rental properties, there is limited to virtually no control, which impacts resident/tenant safety and neighbourhood safety. There would also be increased foot and vehicle traffic as well as the impact on parking.

Size and Setbacks: As said in our initial submission, the proposed size is too large and should be less than 500 sq ft. Many condos in Guelph are this size or smaller. The proposed setbacks are much too close to property lines, with 1.5 meters being too little. The setback should be increased to provide more distance from the property line. This will minimize or eliminate any buffer space, resulting in increased noise complaints, along with possible light pollution and other expected disturbances. Any unit should be one (1) storey only. Creating a unit on most properties that are more than one storey will impact the privacy of neighbouring properties and be very obtrusive.

I have lived in Guelph for over 30 years and having lived in both the downtown core and the neighbourhood we are currently in. I have seen Guelph grow and develop but as I said previously, the growth in absentee landlord owned property in this neighbourhood has increased over the years, to the detriment of the neighbourhood. The recommended changes as presented will do nothing to improve a situation that the city has yet to be able to fully manage given existing zoning restrictions.

Thank you in advance for your attention to these concerns,
Michelle McCarthy & Mario Gozzi

I would like to comment on the proposal In the above subject line.

I believe that if this proposal is for one Area of the city, in all fairness to all residents of the city, the amendments should allow all areas of the city to participate.

Additionally, for accessory apartments, a ceiling height if 6feet 5 inches under duct work is an unreasonable expectation for older areas of the City. The ceiling height should not matter. If the proposed renter does noT have an issue with the ceiling height, why should it matter to the city. It would provide additional affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Cathy Aldersley

The ability of having our son & daughter-in-law build a residence on the back of our property of XX Hastings Blvd, would not only secure our future capacity of staying in a home we have owned for 50 years last August, as well as securing the possibility of our grandchildren the opportunity to live comfortably when they are starting out in the real estate market! In hindsight, we wish we had the opportunity to do the same for our parents, twenty years ago! Securing this viability to live out our days, knowing that assistance is available in our own back yard! Thank you for listening to our view as seniors who like to chose our destiny,

Barry & Lillian Bower

objections.listed below for rejecting the recommendations

- Two Storeys: will reduce sunlight, privacy & shade vegetation; will loom over neighbouring backyards; will result in an ugly backdrop for neighbours; you can't build a fence tall enough to block the view of a 2-storey 860 square foot extra residence so close to your own deck; reduce to single storey to be less obtrusive
- Size: 860 square feet is bigger than some houses in Guelph; reduce maximum size to 500 square feet or less, the size of a small apartment; ample room for an aging parent or young adult son or daughter;
- Setbacks: 1.5 meters is too close to the property line & will eliminate the possibility of a green space buffer; noise from foot traffic, music, loud talking, illumination at night will have a negative impact on adjacent dwellings
- Affordable Housing: will not be achieved by allowing backyard residences in our area; students come first because they offer landlords the most lucrative proposition;
- Licensing of Rental Properties: most cities license rental properties to facilitate inspections and bylaw enforcement; because Guelph does not, the city has no handle on rentals, whether they comply with current bylaws,

whether they are safe, and whether an absentee landlord arranges even minimal care for property standards; licensing would be an added tool both for the City and tenants

- Student issues: include examples of issues that have not easily been resolved under the current bylaws; calls to Police and Bylaw re noise, large gatherings, property standards etc. because adding an extra 2-bedroom dwelling to a problem house passes a tipping point; the proportion of students relative to the general population is very high in Guelph compared to some other university cities which is why we have many of the issues we currently do; dangerous precedent to allow absentee landlords to add 820 square feet of accommodation in the backyard of a problem student house.

Yvonne Paterson

Good day

I would like this letter added to Council's package for the December 14 meeting.

The most contentious aspects of these recommendations (for our neighbourhoods anyway) include permitting accessory dwellings up to 860 square feet in back or side yards of detached, semi-detached and townhomes, two storeys tall and about 1.5 meters from the property line, and with up to 2 bedrooms. Most of us in Wards 5 and 6 need no explanation of why, in a student-heavy neighbourhood, this is NOT acceptable. We also take the position that if affordable housing is the goal of permitting accessory houses in backyards, it will not have the intended effect in Wards 5 and 6. Those who need affordable housing the most will not be able to compete with absentee landlords who cater to students.

- I can imagine how my quality of life would be impacted by a 2-storey accessory residence, 1.5 meters from my deck or patio, rented by students who are night owls and love to party.
- Two Storeys: will reduce sunlight, privacy & shade vegetation; will loom over neighbouring backyards; will result in an ugly backdrop for neighbours; you can't build a fence tall enough to block the view of a 2-storey 860 square foot extra residence so close to your own deck; reduce to single storey to be less obtrusive
- Size: 860 square feet is bigger than some houses in Guelph; reduce maximum size to 500 square feet or less, the size of a small apartment; ample room for an aging parent or young adult son or daughter.
- Setbacks: 1.5 meters is too close to the property line & will eliminate the possibility of a green space buffer; noise from foot traffic, music, loud talking, illumination at night will have a negative impact on adjacent dwellings
- Affordable Housing: will not be achieved by allowing backyard residences in our area; students come first because they offer landlords the most lucrative proposition;

- Licensing of Rental Properties: most cities license rental properties to facilitate inspections and bylaw enforcement; because Guelph does not, the city has no handle on rentals, whether they comply with current bylaws, whether they are safe, and whether an absentee landlord arranges even minimal care for property standards; licensing would be an added tool both for the City and tenants
- Student issues: include examples of issues that have not easily been resolved under the current bylaws; calls to Police and Bylaw re noise, large gatherings, property standards etc. because adding an extra 2-bedroom dwelling to a problem house passes a tipping point; the proportion of students relative to the general population is very high in Guelph compared to some other university cities which is why we have many of the issues we currently do; dangerous precedent to allow absentee landlords to add 820 square feet of accommodation in the backyard of a problem student house.
- Re: Attachment 1- "Residential Intensification means"...page 9..e) "the conversion or expansion of existing residential buildings to create new residential units or accommodation, including residential dwelling units and rooming houses." I take exception to having rooming houses in this description. Are they regulated? We have an absentee landlord who owns the home across from our house that we purchased and have lived in since 1976, which is being rented by Family and Children Services. This was unknown to the city until I emailed my Ward councillor regarding the fires and disruptive behavior of the teenagers and foul language that was yelled at all hours. Only then, upon visiting did the city know what that house was being used for. I can see a very many future issues just like this if rooming houses are left in the description.
- Re: Survey Response Summary...3% of respondents lived out of town. It is not indicated if these were included in the results. Reading through the comments, some were mis-allocated to the Strongly and Somewhat Agree portion and should have been re-allocated to the correct Strongly and Somewhat Disagree portion. Looking at the number of responses, the Strongly and Somewhat Disagree responses far outweigh the Agree responses for all the questions.
- Most homes that could have an Additional Residence on the property are the older homes with treed lots. Our canopy cover is at 23.3% according to the Urban Forest Management Plan and we should be at 40%. To allow more trees to be removed, as they most certainly will to facilitate construction of an additional residence and driveway, we will see this 23.3% be significantly reduced. This should not be allowed! The Tree Protection Bylaw on private property MUST be enhanced, if not already.
- The city is already looking for more water sources, according to the papers, so this will just add to the issue. When Clair/Maltby is constructed, then what is the plan for a water source?
- Re: Intensification... I understand that Clair/Maltby will be home to a new 25,000 people. Is that not enough to satisfy the intensification quota? Why is this Additional Residential Dwelling Unit being pushed through?
- Please rethink very carefully what you are doing to our city and neighbourhoods.

Kind regards
Linda Liddle

Honestly, this proposal is absurd. The south end (Ward 5) is already inundated with student rentals. If the objective is to improve the stock of affordable housing in Guelph at the expense of stable family neighborhoods where we are already under pressure with absentee landlord student housing is a short sighted solution.

This sounds typical with Guelph though, runaway property taxes, housing with drive waves onto busy roadways, unchecked development along Gordon with substandard road infrastructure, a downtown which is scary etc etc.

The city needs to start listening to the silent majority in this town. Backyard residences will only exasperate these issues. As it is I am exhausted with how many times I have had my car rifled which is something that has only begun in the last 4 or 5 months.

The elite of this city, especially some of our elected officials need to speak up and remember who put them there in the first place

Stephen Runge

Hello,

This is very concerning living in a high investor area.
I know the intent is for family homes to expand to meet the need of kids and parents, however it opens up a whole new problem.
The changes are scary, investors will bend every rule and act dumb to the regulations just as they do now.
WOW....if this ever goes through it will cause MORE problems.
God help us....here goes the anxiety. When will peace come to family homes in the area.

SO much for quality of life here !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Rick Davidson

I am very concerned about the above issue. I understand the province is encouraging infill to increase density, however, residents who have lived in the area should be taken into consideration. I have lived in the Old University neighborhood for 30 years and have seen it change from a lovely, "green" area with unique homes, big trees and beautiful gardens into a subdivision, where trees have been removed to make room for monster houses that have been squeezed, two at a time, on previously one house lots. There has been a significant increase in traffic, pollution and noise. We already have a large student population in this neighborhood and are often subjected to loud and "interesting" conversation as well

as littering when bars are open and some of these students wander home in the middle of the night. So, if people choose to build additional structures and benefit from the income, at least let the impact on neighboring properties be minimal. Strict rules need to be in place.

I totally agree with Michelle Wan's recommendations to keep it to one, one story structure with only one bedroom and at least three meters away from the property line. In fact I agree with all her points. (her e-mail dated December 8)

Sincerely,
Gitta Eizinger-Housser
