

Clerk, City of Guelph

1 Carden St. , Guelph ON

Dear Sir:

Subject: **Additional Residential Unit Review**

I am requesting that I receive from you a written notice of Council's decisions on OPA 72 and on Zoning Amendment OZS20-02.

The report before Council fails to mention a number of direct and indirect negative financial implications for both the City and for residents that arise from the many issues that were brought to the City's attention as expressed in the course of the Have Your Say process. The following are but a few examples that indicate the lack of analysis in the report of important implications of the initiative.

Flooding – the additional impermeable surfaces from the added roofs and driveways will increase the frequency and severity of flooding. The City will be obliged to increase spending beyond its current plans on stormwater management and increased sewer capacity. Given that the majority of the City lacks any stormwater controls, this will prove most expensive. Homeowners will suffer direct losses from floods and from increased insurance premiums. The City and Province will shoulder increased costs of claims and disaster relief, indefinitely.

Bylaw and Zoning Administration and Enforcement – there will be a need for significant expansion of staff needed to administer and enforce this initiative. These are *direct* financial implications. Moreover, as neighbours both fear and feel the impacts of the initiative, they will be increasingly demanding and assiduous in filing formal complaints and expecting follow-up action by staff and Councillors both to ensure compliance with the letter of the ZB as well as the usual rental property standards issues.

Assessment Loss – as expressed in Have Your Say, the initiative has understandably fueled fears that much larger student ghettos will now expand to engulf areas of larger lot, single family residential streets that have been stable to date with relatively small amounts of student rentals. The quality and appearance of some recent student-focused additions and renovations by some absentee investors in my own neighbourhood have been akin to mining camp bunkhouses or barracks. As quality neighbourhoods near the University degrade into student ghettos and are no longer seen as attractive for single family occupancy, the remaining homeowners will increasingly organize appeals to the Assessment Review Board for reductions in their taxable assessments. This will not only offset increased assessments for the second and third units, but will also trigger the need for the City to spend staff time making ARB hearing appearances in defense of assessed values.

What appears to be also missing from the report is a fulsome and honest discussion of effective *mitigative* measures that the City could and should take to manage the initiative sensibly. Until such information is presented to Council, it would be quite premature for it to consider and act on the recommendations.

Bill Mungall