

Delegation Letter re: 78 & 82 Eastview

Parking / Traffic – is noted issue in the first iteration of this process that is unanimously a concern for all current residents. Not a lot seems to have been done to address that issue in the most recent submission. Oddly, instead, the new proposal includes an apartment building, which is even higher density. Parking and traffic on Eastview and Starwood is already an issue – putting a 5 story apartment building on that corner will just further exacerbate this issue. Furthermore, the plan includes inserting a turn lane, which will eliminate the extra space currently used by road parkers on Eastview. For 27 different residences on Starwood there is constantly 12 or more cars parked on the street. Adding to this issue is that one of the entrances to this development is deemed to be too close to the existing intersection. It appears that the proposed solution is to simply put the words “Emergency Access” on the plan and the problem is solved. That doesn’t address the problem as (If you look at the plan) it will still be the PRIMARY access for all the proposed townhouses and it is still too close to the existing intersection and creates a safety hazard for children and vehicles. I think either the ‘Emergency Access’ should be moved further away from the intersection or some sort of gate / barrier should be installed to ensure that it is in fact only used for emergencies. Alternatively, perhaps reduce the development to within the 150m distance from Eastview so only 1 entrance is needed.

I feel that this property is too long and narrow for the proposed development. My understanding is that for a development to go beyond 150m from the main road it must have a 2nd exit. The current plan has at least 10 units beyond the 150m limit who would only have 1 road to enter and exit. I note a firetruck turn around in the far north end, but that is moot if road parking prevents the fire truck from reaching the northern most block of towns, or if there was a fire starting near Eastview, the residents in the north end would be trapped. If a fire occurred in February at the northern most units, there were snow banks narrowing the road and then cars parked there too (because there always will be), meaning a fire truck would not be able to get back to fight the fire, which, given the proximity would then put all our houses on Starwood in jeopardy as well. I recognize an attempt was made, but even the new proposal makes it evident that this property is simply too long and narrow to be developed without putting the future residents and existing residents on Starwood at undue risk. Let’s also not forget that’s it backs onto existing green space on two of three sides. It would look very bad on the city if fire ripped through our greens space because we tried to squeeze in a couple of townhouses where there wasn’t space and fire trucks couldn’t get in to do their job.

It’s my understanding that the City has requested 2 water connections to Eastview Road, which contradicts the City’s policy of only allowing 1 water service for each property. The 2nd water service allows the developer to extend the water service beyond the standard maximum 150m from the watermain (without looping). I believe the site should only be allowed 1 water service and maintain the maximum 150m water service from the road.

One of the councillors noted that she will not support any development in Guelph that is not Net Zero. I do not see any reference in the new proposal to how that is going to be

accomplished here? Perhaps the developer is flatly ignoring the request of the councillor and expecting it to pass with the votes of the others.

Looking at the new plan, it is still evident that the proposed properties encroach on the protective buffer of the green space. Some units have 50% of their back yards falling beyond into the buffer zone. This I think is another clear example that this property is too narrow for this type of development. If this moves forward, as is, there will be no way to police the protection of protected space, so for the sake of our shared green space I think none of the proposed units / properties should be allowed to touch the buffer. Residents there could easily dispose of environmentally damaging materials that could seep into and / or pollute our greenspace and do it in complete privacy. There should be a clear delineation between private property and the protected greenspace buffer. What's the point of the buffer if we allow it to be encroached upon?

Mayor Guthrie wanted to see sidewalks in the new plan. While it looks like some were drawn, there is no reference to them in the Legend, which is otherwise quite thorough. If it does include sidewalks, that should be captured and documented in the proposal. If in fact the plan still does not include sidewalks for the residents, that is an issue. Again, not enough space for this development on such a long narrow property.

I read the environmental impact report and it noted that it claims the only wildlife affected would be bugs and butterflies etc. That is simply not true. There is a small nature corridor immediately behind our houses is home to a number of birds, rabbit families and other small animals. My children look forward to watching them come out and hop or run around in the mornings and evenings. We also frequently have deer roaming and grazing in the green space behind our house (see attached). Sunday morning I saw a coyote and her pup trotting across the property. The plan, as it stands now, appears as though it will destroy the corridor of trees and shrubs that line the back of our properties on Starwood. The road in some parts appears to almost butt up right to our property lines. Where there may be enough distance for the road, certainly when it comes time to plow – there will be no space in some areas for the snow to go without damaging that corridor. This would be an issue because it would kill plant and wild life and there is a safety concern for those of us with young children.

My last issues are more technical and deal with the diagram itself. I admittedly am not an engineer or a public crusader so I have never seen one of these before so I'm trying to teach myself as I work through it. Looking at the diagram there is a 'Key Plan' picture which has the property in question with a red dashed 'x'. Almost half of the property in question, that is included is protected wetland space, that is not part of the building plot. Now looking at R.3A-xx it appears that some of the requirements are based on a percentage of the land area in question. The three that I am questioning are;

- Minimum landscaped open space. (% of Lot area).
- Maximum building coverage. (% of Lot area).
- Maximum density of site. (50 units / ha).

The fact that the 'Key Plan' includes all of the protected wet land has me wondering if the developer included the dimensions of the protected space in its' calculations for R.3A-xx. As the land is protected and cannot be developed I don't think it should be included and if it is being included it is deceptive. If the wetland was included when calculating the total area I it would allow the developer to squish in double the density for the site and only have to comply with half the open space allotment. The area should only include the buildable area. I would like to see if the densities still confirm if the area measurement included only the space that isn't protected wetlands. Again, this is the first time I've looked at something like this, so apologies if I'm off base with this, but I would appreciate confirmation.

I believe that once you move beyond 150m from Eastview the added risk and the negative impact to the current Starwood constituents and the protected greens space far out weigh the opportunity of being able to collect 16 more property taxes.

Thank you for your time.

Joe Costello