

Statutory Public Meeting Report 721 Woolwich Street Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment File: OZS20-015 Ward 2 – 2021-24

General Correspondence – Revised Agenda

I am in support of the zoning change as the next step in providing housing support to our homeless citizens.

Susan Honeyman

I am 100% in favour of turning the motel into supportive housing. We have for too long overlooked the homeless in our community and it is time we took action. This project will improve the neighbourhood, given that there will be staff on hand to deal with problems as they arise and the building will be improved.

Ann Middleton

I support the application to convert the Parkview Motel to 32 apartment units. It should be able to happen quickly to give housing to people

Thank you for your planning

Anne Holman

I would like to express my feeling about the conversion of the Parkview motel. Canadians that went to work every day built this country, I am one of them. I live on Marilyn Dr I am not an uncaring person

I worked at imperial tobacco for 36 years we had a program that allowed us to give to the united way through payroll deduction x number of dollars to be taken of my pay every week.

As a owner and tax payer who keeps this country going ,should have our concerns taken serious. Thank-you for reading my e-mail linda

Linda Clewes

I am a resident on Fairway Lane in Guelph and on numerous occasions have observed the homeless setting up camps in the woods leading down Woodlawn to the river from the Country Club

I am also a member at the Guelph Curling Club where we have camps off and on between us and Walmart

Since the good old days of the Parkview I would only guess that it is not the thriving place it used to be

I support the renovation of this sight for the homeless

Now if I lived on Marilyn drive I suspect I might have a different outlook !!

Ross Bairstow

Dear Guelph City Councillors and Staff members:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application for zoning change. I fully support the change to Specialized General Apartment zoning and the transformation of Parkview Motel to supported affordable housing. I welcome this proposal as an important step to meet our city's commitment to ending homelessness and helping people living without homes to establish residences. The support staffing planned will help ensure success of a healthier, well-serviced place for these citizens, and will offer them a way to experience security and safety, and build stronger community.

The Virtual Open House of January 26th was helpful in clarifying plans for the proposed project, its costs and benefits. I want to congratulate those who presented it and are working on the project for their clear vision and pragmatic approach.

The transformed building will improve aesthetic appearance, stability, and private property values in the Marilyn Ave. neighbourhood. It deserves full support from all of us in Guelph.

Sincerely,

Sally Ludwig

We thank You for the opportunity for the input on this subject. We feel however that the decision has already been decided by Council as per normal. We live in the North end of town. Even though we have locks on our gates, it does not stop people breaking into our back yard. Just last week we were broken into along with our neighbors. They have no regard for others property. They simply break or take what ever they want. We cannot have anything removable on our front porch as it will be gone in no time. Will housing for those that need it(I am sure they do) help the situation? Will this be enhancing our security? We don't know, only time will tell. I do feel the housing across the road of the Motel have more reason to make

their statement heard. It is a safety issue for those of us living in the North End of town.

Thank You for your time

Gerald Fisher

I am very much in favour of the Motel being a permanent home site. The city really does need more of this type of housing.

J. Norris

I oppose changing the zoning because this a highly populated senior area of the city and we don't need the problems that will come with the rezoning for the reason or reasons that certain individuals have in mind.

Garry Marsh

The majority of residents in our building are Senior citizens. Their voice needs to be heard. The feedback I have received indicates their fear of this conversion and are adamantly against this. This should not be a quick fix, accessing taxpayers money to promote an project that is inappropriate for this location. Does this represent a general opinion that seniors are once again devalued in our society? On the other hand, why not find accommodations for smaller groups who need supportive housing? Please do not turn this into a ghetto, stigmatizing a group who need more individual support. Smaller support homes have proven to be more successful for providing these vulnerable individuals with a sense of belonging , addressing their individual needs and encouraging positive two-way interactions with the community.

Linda Braithwaite

Hi there,

Good morning,

I **support** -supportive housing being built/created at 721 Woolwich. Therefore I am in support of the zoning for this location being changed from hotel to residential.

I live and work near this area.

COVID19 has put a magnifying glass to the inequities in our community. Individuals against this supportive housing application are also probably against people using drugs. Well if you don't have a safe space to live your other determinants of health are significantly negatively impacted which could lead to severe mental health and drug use.

Please, this zoning change must be approved. It is time for us to step up for our entire community not just some of its members.

YIMBY!!!

Thanks for listening

Abby Richter

To Whom It Concern;

I am writing to you regarding the purchase agreement for the Homeless Shelter at the Parkview Motel.

Just to be clear I have sent this letter once to councillor Goller and he has responded. But since the original announcement I cannot count the numerous times I have seen the police at this motel. The sale of this motel was originally said to be good for the city's homeless I understand that, but there has been no indication of it being a respectable place yet and the conversion has not even happened yet.

I cannot express enough my unhappiness after hearing of this sale. I have resided on Marilyn Drive almost 10 years now and during my stay I have experienced a lot of incidents that are not conducive for an area that has been filled with seniors for many many years. Riverside Park is a very busy area with families constantly visiting the park. In the past 10 years we have had break-ins to our condominium building by either a person breaking into the building and into the laundry rooms and stealing the change out of the machines. This in turn results in higher condo fees for us to fix these machines as well as the broken doors. There have also been homeless residents come in and use our steam room showers and washroom in our gym.

I was appalled at hearing there was going to be a drug clinic installed where the old McDonald's building used to be on Woolwich street. This will reduce our property value and safety. Now with this announcement it is a great concern to me. Do the residents of this city not get a say in anything that gets installed in their area that reduces the value of their property and safety ?

On many an occasion I have walked downtown and heard and seen residents who have challenges in life with drugs and homelessness and do understand we need to support these folks but why must this be located near many seniors' buildings and a busy public park.

I am sure the council will try and tell the residents in the area, that there is not going to be a safety issue. I have witnessed firsthand a police squad closing our street, for individuals who have been held up in the hotel and creating problems.

This area in the last 10 years has become so bad with "questionable individuals" hanging out at the corner of Marilyn and Woolwich on bicycles waiting around checking cell phones and it is plain to see they are not out cycling.

Thank you for your time

Anne Porteous

I fully support the zoning change to create supportive housing for Guelph citizens!

Respectfully,

Jan Sherman

good Evening,

I am a resident near the Parkview Motel which is being considered for a zoning change to residential from motel.

I am in support of the change of the Parkview Motel to supportive housing units. I understand that the plan is to have supervision available at the housing unit 24-7. I think that is a very good idea and likely will assist potential tenants in their transition from homelessness to more stable living arrangements.

I think it is time for our city to support these community driven projects since homelessness is such a critical issue in Guelph.

I often remember on occasions when I see folks living on the street this phrase "there but for the grace of God go I".

thanks for reading and carrying this message forward.

Yours truly,

Janet Chevalier

resident Ward 2.

Hello,

I live in the neighbourhood, and I SUPPORT the application for this housing.

Karen Wendling

I support this Housing. IT is important everyone has a place to live.

Marion Cowan

We oppose this application based on the evidence and facts as set out below:

1. ZONING CRITERIA

The Parkview motel is best described as a 1950s wasted space. It is a single story, stretched building , covering a small portion of the property. Every room has a door access to outside. Each room has its own window style air conditioning unit, which is bricked into the outside wall. The windows and doors are 1950s vintage as is the general construction and overall insulation. The wasted energy required to heat and cool this building is significant. Changing a few doors and windows is meaningless. The proposal is to house 32 people in an area that would accommodate two to three high density residential buildings, housing hundreds of people. The life expectancy of these old relics should be terminated as soon as possible, not extended indefinitely by the waste of tax payers dollars.

The province has issued guide lines pertaining to land use and zoning; the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 being one example. The Planners hired by the applicants have tried to fit their clients under these guide lines. The language is quite creative, however even a cursory examination will show that this proposal does not meet any of the criteria. They are paid to put the best spin on a bad idea. The assertion that the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood is a blatant lie. It is our understanding that the province expects Guelph to increase its population by some 60,000 within a reasonable time frame. The city has reached its limit going sideways, so the only solution is up. This area, including the Parkview was dealt with in 2019. The Official Plan includes moderate to high density residential construction. There is reference to a high-density corridor. What has changed from 2019 ?

By perpetuating this wasted space with tax payer`s dollars, what impact does that have on the development of adjoining land? This is somewhat speculative, however

the applicants` planners appear to have no difficulty in making the bald assertion that the proposed use will not prejudice a broad range of uses. They further suggest that this scheme is a form of redevelopment. So now going backwards means going forward.

To conclude, this is exactly the type of structure and wasted land use the province wants to illuminate as soon as possible not perpetuate at tax payers` expense.

COSTS OF ACQUISITION AND RENOVATION

The Drop in Centre is paying the owners \$3,800,000 to acquire this property. The executive director Ms. Huekstra stated that the price was arrived at because that is what the owner wanted. No cost projections have been provided, other than the planner`s statement that new doors and windows are to be installed. No information as to the costs of maintenance, including heating and cooling. No comparison with a high-density new construction.

Obviously, the housing of those with mental handicaps and drug addictions is and will be a cost to society. These costs are projected to increase as is the demand. Except for a few private donations, the entire project is funded by taxpayers` dollars. The question is not whether we should provide the housing, but is this project cost effective. After spending millions of dollars, we are still left with an old useless building and wasted place, that can only house 32 people.

MIXING DRUG ADDICT AND RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

There is no jurisdiction in Ontario, Canada, or North America where such a scheme exists or is even contemplated. The applicants are unable to point to any other jurisdiction, to support this ill-conceived plan. In the propaganda video produced by the mayor and Huekstra, reference is made to Barrie. I have travelled to Barrie and spent some time observing that location, the configuration of the building and the surrounding neighborhood. There is no resemblance to the Parkview. I have also attended the Bridges in Cambridge, and spoken to staff. The Bridges was built some 18 years ago for the specific purpose of housing those with mental problems and those with various forms of drug addiction. It is a multi-story building, located in a commercial area. Access is controlled 24 hours a day. Staff is able to monitor who comes and goes. Given the configuration of the building a curfew can be enforced. I have also visited the House of Friendship in Kitchener and the facility for juveniles, and spoken to staff, and also management in the Region. I followed this up with inquiries in Toronto and New York City. All of these jurisdictions have addressed this housing problem in the same manner.

Years of experience have shown that mixing the housing of drug addicts with residential neighborhoods is a formula for disaster. To feed their daily habit, they engage in criminal activity including, thefts, assaults, break and enters, and vandalism. Drug paraphernalia is left in the surrounding area. To lessen the impact on neighborhoods, all jurisdictions have followed the same formula: 1. Building or

renovation of high-density structures. 2. Controlling access by design of the building. 3. Selecting locations that create a reasonable buffer from residential areas.

THE PARKVIEW

Our townhouse is located across the street from the motel, about the middle of the building. We have a good view. The police think so too. On a number of occasions, they have parked in our driveway in order to conduct surveillance on the drug activity carried on by people sent there by the Drop in Centre. The police are not that interested in the addicts, but in the traffickers that follow the addict. The Parkview is a dealer's delight. Each room has direct access to the outside. Apprehension is difficult because the suppliers simply run into the building, where the transaction takes place behind closed doors. To date the addicts have numbered one or two at a time. The proposed use will now multiply that activity ten and twenty times. The traffickers now have their customers in one place. Great for business.

We are told that the plan is to have staff on hand 24/7. Right, some want-to-be social worker sitting in an office at one end of the building, will control the traffic in drugs half a block away at the other end?

CONCLUSION

Those of us who oppose this application do so on irrefutable evidence and facts. All of our submissions can be supported, not only by the material provided herein, but by anyone checking with jurisdictions all over North America and elsewhere. On the other hand, the applicants have produced not a thread of evidence to support this application. In fact, they have been successful in spreading disinformation through the "mayors' video", the high jacking of the "town hall", with the help of counsellor Gordon, which shielded the executive director of the Drop in Centre from answering questions from residents directly affected.

Eric Hafemann

We are in favour of the changes needed to convert the Parkview to supportive housing.

Anne and Jim Shute

re: File no:OZS20-015

Ms Nasswetter:

The re-zoning area indicated above does not have my approval. As a taxpayer who live in this community I do not approve of this area to be designated as a Drop In Center Corporation. Here are far better options:

1) Downtown Guelph has a property across from the Transit system that would accommodate clients without having to walk a long distance. The people who would live in that building would have access to Medical offices of all types right at their doorstep. Other accommodations could be incorporated for both clients of the Drop Center, Office staff that already are renting properties downtown, such as: Ms Koekstra, the Doctors who will be working with the tenants, Nursing staff. The Injection sites would be an excellent place as well, not to mention, they would also have plenty of space for extension should the need arise. Separate bedrooms, TV rooms, Game room. They would not have to be in their bedrooms all the time. Ms Koekstra in her Town Hall Meeting expressed that she wanted to have a group kitchen for the tenants, there would be plenty of space for that as well. The Mayor has been saying for a long time that those buildings downtown need to be renovated and what better way to do that by using this building for this project. Stop Isolating them and put them where they want to be, where the action is!

The amount of money that was offered for 721 Woolwich and what the City proposes to give for this project would be a far better investment. More Building for your money and much better environment for those who would live there.

Thank you

Louisa MacPhee

To whom it may concern: I am writing to express my support of the Drop In Centre's proposal to develop the Parkview into affordable/supportive housing. I have worked with the Drop In in the past and they have housed some of my patients/clients there. It's basically used for that purpose as it is but it would be better if it was more formalized and then funded and staffed appropriately. It is in a good location, close to public transit, close to amenities and low cost shopping at Walmart.

I hope the city supports this project.

Leah Scott
Social Worker
Guelph, ON

We live directly across from the Parkview Hotel.

We moved here from Toronto 3 1/2 years ago because it was a safe place to retire, our grandchildren would love visiting and elderly relatives had direct access to our home.

We have provided financial support to the homeless (and other worthy causes) for decades now. Our daughter is a social worker specializing in mental health. We understand and support the need for housing for addicts and mental health sufferers.

We do not think that our high-density community filled with seniors and grandchildren is an ideal location for housing these homeless people. NONE of the other supportive housing locations that have been referred to as success-stories are directly in a residential nor in a seniors community. As you consider the application to rezone this area, we hope that the city of Guelph will agree that this is NOT an ideal location.

With so many recent closures, there are plenty of empty buildings, schools, motels in commercial areas, as well as industrial buildings that are empty and available for re-zoning throughout Guelph.

Many are much better suited to house chronically homeless people.

We are very nervous about additional addicts living across the street. We know what trouble they've brought to the area, when only several rooms have housed them. It is terrifying to imagine what will happen when 32 single men who are addicts with no source of income, live in our quiet, safe street.

Many of us have been robbed, cars broken into and have been yelled at by unfortunate and desperate men on the street 10 m from my front door.

Please seriously consider the safety of your residents.

Thank you for reviewing my concerns.

Most sincerely,
Adele Wootton

Hello,

I live on Marilyn Drive across the road from 721 Woolwich Street in Guelph. I am emailing to voice my objection to the proposed by-law change.

I do not think this is the right place for the proposed use.

Also with Riverside Park being just down the street, I am not sure what the possible effects would be ie drug related issues.

I do not believe comparisons to the property in Barrie are fair or accurate.

Thank you

Doug Martin

I am writing as a Ward 2 constituent to say that I **DO** support the conversion of the Parkview motel to supportive housing. We do have a serious homelessness problem in Guelph and must take care of this vulnerable population. Having **supportive** housing is a positive measure for this population.

Isobel Boyle

To Whom it May Concern

I am adding my name to say I am in favour of the amendment to the zoning by-law regarding 171 Woolwich Street. I think it is a good idea to have a safe place for those who don't have a permanent home. I would also like to say that I hope there will be support staff on duty 24/7 to address any difficulties which may occur and which might assure those who don't think it is a good idea.

Thank you for the opportunity to have input into this matter.

Sincerely,

Diana Root

Mr. Mayor, Councillors and Ms. Nasswetter,

The supportive housing solution that the Drop-In Centre is proposing at the Parkview to help deal with homelessness in our community is something that we should NOT hesitate to implement.

The only a few things that I can think of to criticize, and I would hope that it would be taken as constructive criticism, is that I would have hoped for at least a two-story building to maximize the footprint of the existing building and grounds. However, I also understand that putting on a second story, if architecturally feasible, would require at lot more money and more time, so I would concede that if we can get this valuable support in place by next winter, we should go ahead with all speed. The fact that social supports will be in place will be infinitely more helpful than just warehousing people in motel rooms and will also help to mitigate any concerns that the neighbours across the road might have as to the impact on the local community.

The second thing is that I think the driveway should be made into a crescent shape rather than a one-lane with turnaround. I expect that would reduce the amount of space available for an outdoor sitting area, but despite the fact that most, if not all of the residents probably won't have cars, I still see the possibility of traffic jams if vehicles such as delivery trucks and taxis need to leave and enter through the same laneway.

And finally, the number of parking spaces available should also be reduced from what has been, up to now, the norm for our car-obsessed society, given the nature of the intended residents. I hope there will be bicycle parking and storage available instead.

The concept seems to be working at Loyola House. Now, if we also had a Basic Income combined with social support, I expect we would eventually be able to return Loyola House to its original purpose of being a retreat house....

This project is ideally situated and as a community, we really need to put our money where our collective mouth is.

Respectfully yours,

Joan Hug-Valeriotte

To Mayor Guthrie and City Council.

I was able to watch the virtual Open House presentation about the proposed project.

It was very informative and explained the project and answered many questions which anyone might have about the concept and plans. It would be very helpful for those in the neighbourhood who have reservations and fears, to see this presentation.

The Drop In Centre on Gordon St is not far from my house. It has a good record of supporting homeless people. The building and the grounds around are always well maintained and in recent years there have been vegetable gardens planted. This is the organization which will be managing the supportive housing building and the residents. The location meets many criteria for such a housing unit. There is much support built into the plans so that residents will be carefully chosen and then supported by many community agencies. There will be 24 hour staff on location.

This is just the kind of situation which will help to enable homeless people to enjoy their own place with a lot of support to live in the community and not on the streets.

This project should receive full support to proceed .

Margaret Abbink

Dear Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors,

As a volunteer with ARCH and the harm reduction program for the past decade

I am in support of the zoning by-law amendment for permanent supportive housing located at 721 Woolwich Street.

Permanent supportive housing for those who need it most is both a humane and self serving means of significantly improving the well being of all. This charitable option is a frugal option.

By providing stable housing to individuals in need, they will be better able to productively engage in support services which will mitigate their repeated costly recycling through the medical and justice systems.

Please support the zoning by-law amendment for permanent supportive housing located at 721 Woolwich Street.

Sincerely,

Dan Maitland

I know that affordable housing and homelessness are grave issues, but if these units are to be used for the homeless have you considered the effect it will have on Riverside Park and Bailey Park. I fear that because of addiction being associated with the homeless drug paraphernalia may find its way into these parks. These parks are enjoyed by children if drug paraphernalia or the homeless decide to loiter in these parks the children will stop using them. Can't a vigorous lobby be undertaken for funding from the Federal government to build elsewhere. A signature campaign for example. Thank you

Paul Mackey

Mayor Cam Guthrie and City Councillors

As a close neighbour I support the conversion of the Parkview Motel to Permanent Supportive Housing.

Joan Coxhead

I support the use of Parkview Motel as supportive housing
Yvonne Day

Dear Mayor Guthrie, Guelph City Council, Ms. Hoekstra, Mr. Longfield, Mr. Schreiner, Mr. Poste, Mr. Alton and Ms. Nasswetter:

I am writing to ask for, and underscore the importance of, having a comprehensive, long-term operational plan for the Parkview Motel permanent supportive housing project in Guelph.

On January 26, we were given information about the architectural plan. All the funding and re-zoning requests have been related to the \$8.6 million construction project. But nobody seems curious about what we are really building here: a large, permanent community of 32-64 individuals with high acuity needs.

I came across a recent (June 2020) systematic review and meta-analysis of 72 independent studies that have been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of permanent supportive housing. Sharing the link here:

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667\(20\)30055-4/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667(20)30055-4/fulltext) (I will send a PDF version of the article in a separate email.)

The conclusion of the research is that:

- Permanent supportive housing reduces homelessness and increases housing stability.
- Permanent supportive housing had no measurable effect on the severity of psychiatric, substance, income, or employment outcomes when compared with usual social services.

I think that it is important to acknowledge what we would achieve with the Parkview Motel project. And also acknowledge what we are not going to achieve. Parkview will solve houselessness but will likely have no measurable effect on mental illness, substance use, employment outcomes or income for the residents.

So if we have no expectation of change, I think we need to turn our attention to responsibly providing a safe living environment for 32-64 high acuity individuals who will come to the intentional community on Marilyn Drive with high needs and will continue to live with the challenges they arrive with.

Creating and continuing to support this community is a weighty and significant undertaking.

I think of my own block with its 23 houses with (my estimate) 30 separate residential units and a total of ~40 to 50 citizens depending on the season. It's a downtown neighbourhood with a mix of single working people, families, empty-nesters, retirees and students. A few individuals have significant physical and mental health challenges and at least one neighbor has a substance use disorder that has become evident through behaviours like public urination, theft from vehicles and entering a neighbour's home uninvited. But it is our diversity that makes it a comfortable place for us all to live.

I think it would be quite a different experience on our block if each one of us on the street had high acuity needs: a mix of mental and physical health challenges and substance abuse disorders. And that, in effect, is what we are proposing to create with the Parkview Motel project on Marilyn Drive.

It is one thing to admire the architectural plans for the residential building. It is quite another to think about the operational side of this kind of undertaking and the 24/7 responsibility for the safety and wellbeing of these individuals and the staff. And, if this community experience isn't well-managed for the residents and staff, what is the impact on the neighbours who, as we have already established, are themselves mostly vulnerable seniors.

The Parkview Motel project is not a construction project with a humanitarian upside.

As a community, we need to take full responsibility not just for the zoning and construction of a building but for the shaping and ongoing support of the community of vulnerable citizens who will live there. So now that the design, landscaping and construction plans have been shared, I think it is time to share the comprehensive, long-term operational plan.

These are only a few of the questions that I think we should be asking (and that should be documented in a comprehensive, long-term operational plan):

- What specific measures are in place to ensure the safety and security of residents and staff?
- What kind of official commitments do we have from the agencies currently on the list to provide supports? What is the duration of those commitments? How/when will they be renegotiated?
- What is the annual operating budget? What are the funding sources?
- What are the long-term funding commitments? Y1? Y5? Y10? Contingency plan?
- How will residents/tenant support/services needs be assessed and addressed?
- What is the physical plant maintenance and property management plan? Annual budget?
- What is the plan for tenant screening, selection, move-in, evictions etc.? Expected turnover rate?

- What does lease, lease enforcement and rent collection process look like?
- How will occupancy/capacity be managed?
- What is the staffing plan? Who? How many? What qualifications? Cost? How funded?
- How will success of the PSH initiative be measured? Reported? How will this info be shared?
- What specifically have we learned from other PSH projects so far? What are the watchouts?
- What are the specific decisions/policies that have been put in place based on those learnings?

The City of Guelph, the County of Wellington, Guelph City Council, Mayor Guthrie, the Provincial government and Federal government each seem to claim only a small sliver of responsibility for this project and no one seems to be asking for either the big picture overview or detailed, long-term plan.

Everyone seems keen to “tick the box” to end homelessness without being even slightly curious about the larger, longer-term initiative we are putting in place on Marilyn Drive.

So my question is, if not you then who?

Who has responsibility for the big picture here? And who is looking at the details? Are there others with whom I should be sharing my research, my questions and my request for an operational plan?

- Is it key staff members at the City of Guelph?
 - Katie Nasswetter (copied here) or is it Scott Stewart, Kealy Dedman, Krista Walkey, Chris DeVriendt?
- Is it key staff members at The County of Wellington?
 - Mark Poste, Director of Housing, Eddie Alton, Social Services Administrator (both copied here) or Victoria Toman, Mark Skinner, Lori Richer?
- Is it Council members at the County of Wellington?
 - Kelly Linton, Andy Lennox, George Bridge, Gregg Davidson, Allan Alls, Chris White, James Seeley, David Anderson, Earl Campbell, Campbell Cork, Steve O’Neill, Mary Lloyd, Diane Ballantyne, Don McKay, Doug Breen, Jeff Duncan?
- The Guelph Drop-in Centre?
 - Gail Hoekstra (copied here) or the Board members Robin Fishburn, Lori Hasulo, Melanie Guindon, Jane Wilson, Laura Hanley, John Kieffer, Cate Welsh, Jane McKinnon?

Should I contact all of these individuals? Please let me know if you have any advice or insights to share.

Thanks,
Sarah Harwood

I am respectfully writing to express my concerns about the project indicated above. While I fully understand the thought process behind this project, I feel I would be remiss if I did not express my concerns.

I moved to Guelph two years ago after my husband of 50 years passed away suddenly. After careful consideration, I purchased a townhouse on Marilyn Drive. Not only was it a lovely area, but it serviced a lot of my requirements: nearby is a seniors centre, shopping, banking and bus transportation as I do not drive. Also, there are a number of seniors in the area and, as I learned later, some experiencing the same life changing moments that I had. I felt this was a good place to start over.

After the last meeting with council I decided that if I really wanted the facts, some research was called for. First let me state I understand homelessness is of great concern not only in our cities but around the country, and Guelph is no exception. While growing up my family had experiences with people who required help getting their lives back on track so I realize this is a very complicated issue. However, I feel when dealing with homelessness one important fact seems to get lost while looking for a solution. One size does not fit all. In our efforts to find a solution to this problem I think it is overlooked that there are different groups of homeless, each with their own set of circumstances and each requiring their own unique solutions.

The Motel on Woolwich is a perfect example. In a rush to find a solution, I feel some key factors have been overlooked.

I am given to understand the 32 rooms are for the most chronic people without homes. We all acknowledge that with this sector sometimes comes mental health and addiction issues. What seems to be overlooked when finding a solution is that these people have, in some cases, been living like this for a very long time. This is their life and this is all they have come to know. I am given to understand there are going to be rules that these people are expected to abide by. These people do not live by other people's rules or expectations, they are used to living by their own rules: the plans to restrict these people with a strict curfew and security render a lot of the solutions this new home offers ineffective, and is even disrespectful.
Problem #1.

The second problem is the plan for dining facilities: The drop-in centre wants to supply a gathering place for these people, a place where they can be social, similar to the centre downtown. This is a good plan but has not been completely thought out and is likely not feasible. Are you going to provide 3 meals a day? There are no

cooking facilities in the rooms. Will these people end up cooking in their rooms? That is how the fire started in Barrie.

Furthermore, I understand the plan is to have these people pay rent. Problem: they now fall under the Ontario Tenants Act. You cannot monitor nor inspect their rooms without their permission. Is it going to be like now, letting others stay and giving them access without anyone knowing? I have also been given to understand that there will be an agreement they must sign with the rules for renting. I feel some will not accept the conditions without resistance, others will choose to disregard the regulation. When they are caught what will you do? Evict them to the street. Right back where you started.

The Drop-In programme has outlined how friendly and welcoming these people are. I have no doubt in some cases that is true, but is this consistent enough to provide a secure justification for this programme? Have the advocates who determined this been out on the street going for a walk and been followed by a person with issues? Imagine you are 72 and taking a walk in the park by yourself because you are new in the area and need some fresh air. Behind you appears a 6 foot gentlemen talking and yelling at someone who is not there. Nobody is around so you walk a little faster. He picks up his pace. You look around for a different route, none available when all of a sudden he crosses the road and goes into the motel.

I am of an unfortunate number of people who have been in this position and felt completely helpless. It is not a position you want to be in. These people do not wear warning signs. They could be harmless but you do not know this. We teach our children to be careful around strangers. Are you saying because these people are without homes that automatically makes them less of a threat? Needless to say I do not take many walks anymore.

I also understand there will be security at this facility. The motel will be locked down at a certain time with nobody allowed in after a certain hour. Ok, the ones that are late where will they go? I guess to the park. The park that the community uses. The park with activities designed for the public. These people will have camped out all night, sometimes on benches, because all their belongings are in their rooms. The other concern I have is the security. If you are not concerned about these people obeying the rules why is there a need for security 24 hours a day? The fencing that will be placed around this motel is that to keep the tenants in or out? If all these measures are needed then we have to assume there is a possibility of a problem.

The next concern is the addiction problem. Yes you are going to have support staff present for these people but are all of them going to accept the help? Will there be support staff around at night? I think probably not. There have been 3 deaths since October at this motel. All of these at night. Countless rescue calls, all of these people requiring help. Who takes responsibility for these people? You house them, you place them here in our neighbourhood, but will someone take

responsibility for their actions? Is this what is going to happen with the new people or are you relying on the first responders to pick up the slack? You, as a city, have 1 hospital, 1 mental health facility, 1 safe injection site, plus your drop-In centre. Yet you want to set these people up in the north end of the city, away from all of these services which could supplement the support of the housing facility. Yes there is bus service but let's be realistic: are the people in need going to take the bus downtown when everyone is congregated up here? I think not. They are in dire situations and may need help immediately. What's more is activities which have normally been manageable in one area are now spreading across the city, making the problems more difficult to manage and provide help for.

When a visit was made to the shelter in Cambridge a discussion with the facility manager, who has been working with people without homes for a number of years, suggested from his own personal experience, no facility like this belongs in a residential setting. I concluded that is why these facilities are found in commercial or light industrial areas. This begs the question why has this concept not been set up in residential areas all along? Probably because someone decided this was not a sustainable idea, much like this facility manager.

The residents who have concerns about this project are accused by some people as uncaring citizens. This is not the case. We are all willing to lend a helping hand when a helping hand is asked for and do certainly care about these issues that involve our entire community. In so many cases advocates for the homeless see the results they want to achieve but do not take into consideration that these people, in some cases, do not share their vision for solutions to these community problems. They are not interested in your vision for their life. It may work for you but not for them, for many reasons which are as valid as addressing the problem. Simply because this is an idea to address Guelph's homeless does not mean it is ideal or the consequences completely thought through. One size does not fit all.

The solution we are all seeking for homelessness is a very complicated and complex problem. If there was a quick fix do you not think it would have been found by now? Sure if the goal is to get these people off the street and pretend they do not exist then we can keep on with the bandage solutions. However, if we are serious about addressing this problem then I think doing a rezoning and placing these people in a facility with fencing, security, and rules is not the answer we are all looking for. You will be taking a neighbourhood that fits into Guelph's vision of community and changing the landscape forever without fully considering the consequences. You cannot guarantee that out of the 32 units the safety of this community, at some point, will not be placed at risk. If you decide this zoning change is to go through let me ask you one last question: what is the contingency plan for this community when this does not work out as hoped? Every good business model has a contingency plan, especially one with these many variables. If this does not work out as hoped will we go back to the way this motel used to be? Who will take responsibility for the running of the motel? Who is going to be held accountable for the changes? Who will be there to help the community recover

when this plan goes sideways? So many questions that need answers: at the very least, I beg you to observe standard protocol any plan for social change must undergo.

Someone made the comment that anything would be better than what is there now. My response to this is that things can always get worse: who will be left to pick up the pieces? In this case a neighbourhood made up mostly of seniors, who wanted a neighbourhood that was safe and friendly. A place where they could enjoy their retirement. Will they be the ones left to clean up the mess which didn't solve the problem, but merely moved it?

In closing, I would ask you as council to weigh the risks of this zoning change for the sake of not only the people of this community but the people you are placing in this facility. This decision starts with you. Again I ask the question: what happens to all of us when the vision is not realized? The risk is great.

Thank you for your consideration,

S. Bishop

Feb. 4, 2021 Dear Mayor Cam Guthrie and City Councillors:

As a close neighbor, I support the conversion of the Parkview Motel to permanent supportive housing.

I believe we must do what we can to help the less fortunate.

Becky Blackburn

Subject: To be placed on **record as 3 persons opposed to amend zoning by law 721 Woolwich St**

Re amending zoning by law subject lands 721 Woolwich Street
Lots,1,2,3 and 4,Plan 485;Lot 5,Except Part 1 On 61R-4968; Subject to
Ro689274;City of Guelph

*note: disclaimer, some of the quotes used are not word for word literal verbatim quotes. They were taken from context of available public records and were used as basis for arguments against the proposed zone change. We do not have any liability when using these quotes. Thank you.

On the basis that zoning change presently in effect for the subject lands is new. To note that land has been zoned for future use as well as future use of

surrounding properties. Any changes made would effect the new present zoning comprehensive by law that is in effect for the lands, lots surrounding area. The present zone change by law has been in effect more recently and to request a zone change is under the normal 2 year request to apply. Council should not be considering this as it is non conforming to the official city plans. In essence the proposal would cause tampering of the existing zoning by-laws. Thus creating an imbalance in our Ward 2.

#Any zone change would effect the future use of surrounding properties, lots and land use. This will effect future investors as well as present plan owners have of these properties, thus creating an imbalance within our city.

There is not a designate R4 zone by-law for this plan. The request is for a R4A-?? zone which is non existing and adding new R4A-?? designation will affect future use areas in other parts of the city of Guelph. This would be setting forth a new zoning system that could be implemented throughout the city which sets presidencies and predicaments for residents and investors for neighboring properties affecting their zoning in place.

This planned use is not an apartment but is a facility that will be housing inmates, residents with medical needs such as mental health and drug and or substance abuse, as well as some with criminal records as it will have a safe harm area and planned staff required to council them. As Ms. Gail Hoekstra commented "these residents may come and go as they please". They do not have to stay one year or two as she previously stated. This would create a turnstile environment to neighbors as well as the residents of this proposed building. This is not what permanent housing is but is technically a temporary use facility. The term permanent support housing is used many times now in order to obtain federal funds that are now available for these such named projects. The planned units will lack facilities required to create an environment to teach self sufficiency. Permanent support homes require that support enabling residents to be independent. Teaching them skills that could enable self sufficiency. The plans call for 1 common kitchen for 32 residents. This is commonly seen in a facility environment.

:They do not conform to any R4 zone as will have a significant reduction in required parking spaces. This would affect all the neighboring properties that require the short supply of additional city street parking that is presently available. This would then create a congested parking street landscape as well as a great inconvenience and safety risk to present surrounding homeowners, many senior visitors are using walkers or being handicapped themselves would be greatly inconvenienced and put into perilous situation.

#The plans reduction in front, side and rear yard areas will create an unbuffered environment for surrounding properties. There will be not near enough space

between dwellings and street landscape as per current by-laws.

The plans do not show a neighboring community safety plan as would be required with city planning. This zone change request is inconsistent with orderly development of public services, police as well as emergency services. It will create an imbalance within our community that would affect neighboring homes and city.

The plans to house tenants with medical, drug, substance abuse, criminal behaviours, as well as mental health issues could potentially affect the safety and well being of the neighboring residents who are the vast majority senior citizens. The neighboring residents who reside on Marilyn Drive as well as Woolwich are themselves our communities most vulnerable. The neighbouring buildings are at the most, senior community buildings. Nearby is the newly built Senior Centre attracting the entire city of Guelphs seniors who will on a daily basis have interaction on the streets with the plans tenants. As seen within this community as well as others in Ontario, there is a potential to risk of harm, victimization as well as crime that may be committed upon the vulnerable seniors who reside or use neighboring community center, park, street and housing.

There has been no inclusion of the seniors who reside within the Marilyn Drive , Woolwich community as Covid has caused the inability to have public meetings. Many seniors do not have cell phones or use the internet as well. This has hampered their ability to actively engage in decision making in this "age friendly community of Guelph". To have age safely in place there must be a safe accessible outdoor living space. There has been no active engagement of the seniors in decision making for fairness equity and choice regarding their community environment. These legal rights have been ignored. Also seen within this community planning was the name-calling of the residents of Marilyn Drive, Woolwich as "NIMBYs". The Mayor himself has used these coined acronym terms. This was offensive as all the residents support this type of housing but on a much larger scale and in an area where residents and city has input not just one nonprofit agency placed without plan. The use of these terms is very unprofessional and childlike. A bully tactic term used by some social activists to shame opponents.

It was offensive to hear that the residents of this community be given on some social media the advice that "the opponents to this project should move elsewhere". These comments made are so very abusive considering these opponents are vulnerable seniors. It was offensive when comments were made stating that "YIMBYS were good neighbors" and then 'NIMBYS' were perceived as bad neighbors. These were seniors who have in the past have been affected by the crimes committed throughout the years of the very guests of the Drop in Centre who have stayed at the Parkview Hotel. Crimes of breaking into cars, thefts, prostitution, public intoxication, assault, robbery and trespass as a few examples. City Council, Mayor and police are well aware of this activity. Yes, residents have complained for many years about this activity. It seems these have been committed since 1986 when the Drop in Center began using the hotel to

house homeless. It is in their memory of a 77-year-old woman viciously raped and brutally murdered while she resided at the Parkview Motel by a 19-year-old. As vulnerable citizens they have a right to have these well founded fears. They feel uncertain as their perception is that the mayor, without any consideration of the seniors residing nearby, wants to plunge forward with these plans. It has also been seen that the inability to rezone would see the use of LPAT and it will go forward. The mayor himself made this comment and was received as a threat.

I feel the seniors of the Marilyn Drive community have been maligned by the negative comments of the Mayor, Council and proponents of this venture. We have seen that the lack of understanding towards concerns of seniors who are truly vulnerable members of the city. These are the people who volunteer and leave legacies in their wills for these same charities. There was a comment stated that was ageist and not corrected at any time by members of the City of Guelph, by Ms, Gail Hoekstra. She complained that the city offers funding for a St Joseph's planned senior community and why would they need this when they already have roofs over their heads. Why would there be a need for them to have affordable housing.

She came into the August meeting, unannounced seeking to gain attention to her plans to purchase the Parkview. This was a disruptive act to blindside the community and council meeting settling their planned agendas. This was a terrible comment as seniors have so many quick changing needs throughout their short lifetime when they begin this journey into planned care.

Many of the proponents do not live in the Marilyn Drive, Woolwich community and do not have a grasp of this communities vulnerability. We feel the residents of this community need to be fully understood and have the greatest input. They are not against any such housing but this is not a well planned venture and is not a good fit within our senior community who reside here. Remember, we were all once social workers, nurses, doctors, police, town planners, teachers, trades people and many other professional advocators who do have great social insight, experience and knowledge. Our voices should be heard and understood as being valuable contributors to this plan. After all, Guelph did win a provincial award as being a senior friendly community and has strategies implemented by WHO in their city mantra. This mantra has attracted both new residents and investors and will attract future investments in this rapidly aging city and province. Another comment made by Ms, Hoekstra was that she did not understand why seniors in this community were concerned about the impact of the Parkview plans to house homeless and have safety fears when many were volunteers at the Drop in Centre. We found this an uncaring comment as there is a difference with serving a few hours a week volunteering in a fully staffed supervised building and living 24/7 beside this facility with doors that open into our community with no security. There are many unknown variables.

This zone change will and has already affected the real estate values in the Marilyn Drive community. The balance of the city has seen great increase in value

of realty investment. Marilyn Drive realty was experiencing this also until the news of the Parkview plans. What was available for sale since late August has seen a reduction in value. This is quite alarming as well as abnormal and does not reflect the upward pricing for realty transactions within this city. This is a fact.

The plans of this building are showing doors that fully open into Marilyn Drive. This would allow their residents to come and go 24/7 without supervision at their own discretion. This design should be a safety concern as many of the homeless residents are afflicted with drug, substance abuse, past criminal activities, mental illness or both. There is an equation there that allows unpredictable behaviour within the streets as well as adjoining Riverside Park. It is an unsafe building plan. As well, Parkview residents could be at risk from unwanted visitors to some residents units. The plans are for 32 units. The potential is maybe 70 persons or more at times when there are visitors. It is also in very close proximity to a beer store there should be concerns with this also.

The use of illegal drugs and substances which would be allowed within this facility, having a self harm area, do not harmonize with the moral values of the community surrounding this facility. As seen in other facilities the Drop in Centre is partnered with in Guelph there have been community issues involving illicit drug transactions, overdoses, deaths and undesirable social activity involving others with criminal backgrounds gravitating to these neighborhoods. Ms. Hoekstra has stated there will be about 36 males house in a 32 unit facility.

The Drop in Centre has had issues in the past with staffing issues involving the Stepping Stone. The rising use of illegal use of drugs especially crack cocaine affected the residents as staff was unable to care for these residents caused the facility to close for a period of time. Since this has happened in the past, the risk of a similar situation such as this may arise again. This would pose a risk to the residents as well as neighboring community. Drug abuse continues to grow within this community despite the many small charitable groups interventions. This issue should not be left to groups such as these alone to contend with. This situation should be properly addressed within the social and medical fields that are fully funded by the city, county and province. More money must be placed into these existing services instead of placing sums of money around to the different charities to contend with. It is a mere bandaid. This has not worked as is evident in the numbers of drug abusers and homeless have in fact risen. There was a comment made by the Mayor that plans for housing these patients should be made by these community charity groups as they are the experts and his city is unable to address this. This comment was offensive as many highly educated employees with social and community planning expertise are employed within city hall and the provincially funded government services. Yet we have seen great plans for the balance of citizens and newcomers planning on moving to Guelph. future plans and services included. Since last year there could have and should have been plans made to

house many homeless people with fully funded rapid housing. The Mayor of Toronto within a few months has housed many people with 2 large projects involving modular rapid housing. An entire city has banded together with him to assist making this project happen. It is apathetic to simply hand over this responsibility to a few charities when so much more could be accomplished.

Mayor Guthrie had stated to the residents opposed to this project that this sale of the Parkview was a private sale. I will say No, false, it is actually involving public funding as Ms. Hoekstra has asked the city as well as the county for money towards a down payment as well as a yearly agreed payments to continue in the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars of publicly owned money. The property is on record as being owned by a numbered company registered from Toronto. There is a name seen , I will not mention, involved on the plans as well as the environmental study that is perhaps suspected as being a realtor. I believe the property has passed hands many times and has had seen poor investments made. The past owners were in fact funded mostly in part by the social agency, the Drop in Centre placing homeless for periods at a time. A very steady income unfortunately caused by unstable housing as well as health issues. The building is quite old, appears to be in a poor condition. It has remained unsightly for a long period of time.

The present owners price asked is overly inflated and he will gain I am guessing about a 2 million dollar profit made within the 4 years he has owned this forlorn property. For the city and region to assist with a down payment of an overly inflated priced property is foolhardy when the money will go towards a great profit for the numbered company's owner. This was not a charitable proposed sale. There have been seen no other competing offers.

Staff at the city advised the mayor and council not to proceed with funding this project as there was insufficient money to do so as well as a risk to the city. The Mayor was told bluntly that there was no money in the pot. The mayor protested and attempted to force this to go forward despite expert advice against doing so. Ms. Hoekstra said this must happen quickly, by winter, well it is now almost spring. She had stated that the offer to purchase ended on or about October 14 2020. This date has since passed. She also had stated that she would obtain a request for a zoning change after she owned the property. A request has now been made. So, does she now own the property? Where is the transparency when public funds are requested?

I will compare this facility to the 90 Carden St property the Drop in Centre has partnered with to assist with the issues within the building. There are 50 units there. There are hundreds of police and ambulance calls made to attend with resident issues at all hours. Issues of drug, substance abuse as well as mental health issues. The Mayor himself had stated that when he hears a siren he knows where it is heading. There is rampant crime, robberies and assaults committed within this building as well as surrounding street. There is fear amongst business as

well as pedestrians who must walk by this area. Why would the facility planned for Marilyn Drive be any different? The same Drop in Centre is involved as well as the same residents who are typically homeless with drug, substance abuse, criminal records and mental health issues. Why would this area of Marilyn Drive be a safer one? In 2020 we had a homicide of a security guard in the downtown area, he was viciously beaten and murdered by sadly, a mentally ill and drug dependent young man. He also was known to the social agencies. He is deemed not criminally responsible . The possibility would exist of a scenario such as this within Marilyn Drive, Woolwich and Riverside Park. Mental illness and drug abuse does cause unpredictable behavior at times. To deny any scenario such as this would be very negligent. Ward 2 has the highest amount of seniors and especially Marilyn Drive , Woolwich which is about 85 percent seniors over 65. We all know that these are the most vulnerable members within any community. The Mayor had a solution to crime in the city, "lock your sheds, doors and cars". Simple. We had just recently seen an 85 year old woman's home broken into by a tire iron wielding intruder. We need solutions to the rise in crime. Not a lock it up comment. All this has burdened the entire city, hospitals, ambulance, police and sadly innocent residents of Guelph.

there are many reasons to end this plan. Number one is the social impact the near by residents will be subjected to. The fear of this project continuing has placed an undue stress upon them especially when the Mayor has threatened to make this project proceed. In a senior friendly community we should have never witnessed this. In a time of need for affordable housing in this city we should have seen quick action of the mayor to have housing made on city owned property ie; rapid housing. It should have been here by now.

In a year of election campaigns possibly this project would be used as an election seeking bid as Mayor Guthrie had personal knowledge of these plans well before city council did plus trying to force this sale to continue at the expense of neighboring houses and business protest. City staff advising not to proceed plus being a proponent to tampering with existing zoning newly made bylaws in place.

Recently we saw residents of Beaumont drive band together to stop safe harm housing to be placed within their community. We saw Metrolinx stop plans to build in an area of parkland as residents banded together and protested. Mayor Guthrie said that the residents spoke and these plans were halted. Our argument is that we have spoken, in great numbers despite Covid hampering our ability, despite all the Mayors agenda to proceed forth. Mayor Guthrie, Ms. Hoekstra and Council, we have spoken. We are against the plans to rezone this property. To the vulnerable homeless who require a more permanent plan, we are sorry that your plight seems to have pitted people. We are on record as saying we hope the city hall learns from this and does come up with a larger sensible plan. Let us go on record as saying, " We have spoken."

Mr. and Mrs. John Nielsen and family (3 residents)

Residents of Ward 2, Marilyn Drive senior community.

February 4, 2021

Dear Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors,

My name is Marilyn Langlois and I have never experienced homelessness, drug or alcohol addiction. Having said that, we don't have to look very far to know that there are many people out there that have.

I don't have to be homeless to realize how horrible it is to live on the streets in extreme cold, with no creature comforts eg. a bed with sheets, pillow and blanket; to sleep without fear of being attacked or having my few possessions stolen; how about getting up in the morning and having a hot breakfast, a cup of coffee and someone to share it with? Homeless people are not only taken advantage of, often by other homeless people who are also scared and in need, but they are often lonely, and fearful.

Can you imagine the embarrassment if you were homeless and met someone from your previous life? So many homeless were gainfully employed for many years, but with cutbacks, ill health, depression or whatever the cause was, they are now living on the streets. We need to give people a chance to get back on their feet. Wouldn't you want that?

It's way past the time that we do something concrete about the situation we are facing here in Guelph.

I am writing in support of the zoning by-law amendment for permanent supportive housing located at 721 Woolwich Street.

This group has a plan to end homelessness by 2023. Creating permanent supportive housing for those who need it most is an essential part of making this happen. Permanent supportive housing is a cost-effective solution that is proven to improve people's lives, increase health and wellbeing, and support a stronger community as a result. When everyone in our community has a safe and affordable place to call home everyone benefits.

We will all be winners. People will be given a place to live. They will build community; their health needs will be attended to and they will eventually regain their self respect and prosper; moving on and making room for others to experience the same loving care provided at PSH.

I believe that everyone should have a safe, stable and affordable place to call home, and access to supports to make that possible. I encourage City Council to approve this amendment and help put an end to homelessness in our city.

Marilyn Langlois

Hello, I wanted to indicate my support - as an individual and as a member of the Legacy Men's Group of Guelph, which is in favour of this initiative to provide more affordable housing in Guelph - for the application for change of zoning for 721 Woolwich Street, to be considered at the Council Planning Meeting on Monday February 8th at 6:30pm.

Thank you,

Alain Carriere

The City of Guelph

1 Carden Street

Guelph

February 5, 2021

Dear Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors;

As a neighbour to the Parkview Motel at the corner of Marilyn Drive and Woolwich Street, I support the proposed purchase and use of the Motel to be renovated for housing for homeless citizens of the City. The proposal is a positive step to assist homeless people to turn their lives around.

Homelessness leads to poor health due to the lack of proper nutrition, lack of sleep, insecure finances, and enduring the elements; especially emotional and mental stress due to a bleak present and even worse future.

Judging people for falling prey to alcohol, drugs, mental health challenges or financial insecurity and who may have no family to help them, does not change the situation we all are part of. It is not a helpful or productive stance.

Supporting people who need help is the way to help the whole community thrive.

I am willing to support the project in any way that will help.

Sincerely,

Judith Carson

Good morning. In response to correspondence received by the City regarding the above property, I wish to state my objection to the zoning change.

Here are my concerns:

- The price tag for this property is way to high for a motel in need of repairs. Money pit down the road.
- It is definitely not the proper location for drug addicts/mentally ill to be housed. The location of Riverside Park (with the playground mere meters away), Evergreen Senior's Centre, Woodlawn Cemetery and high density senior population do not mesh.
- Were there any other options even explored? More affordable, better location, etc.
- Of great concern is the fact that Gail Hoekstra and Cam Guthrie have not reached out to speak directly to the neighbours to let us know what their intent is for this property, despite the fact they expect us to welcome the homeless with open arms. Doesn't bode well for the future. If any problems arise, will we be ignored then, as well?

I know that the City wants to help the homeless. Who doesn't. This, unfortunately, is not the location.

Thank you,

Tom Bovaird