

**Statutory Public Meeting Report 85 and 89 Willow Road Proposed Zoning
By-law Amendment File: OZS21-001 Ward 3 - 2021-48**

General Correspondence – Revised Agenda

Dear Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors,

As a volunteer who had weekly contact for a decade with underhoused individuals in need of harm reduction services, I can not stress enough how much permanent supportive housing such as that proposed for 85 & 89 Willow Road would ameliorate their lack of wellbeing.

From my review of the research on this matter, such permanent supportive housing produces optimum results for the expenditure, reducing repeated, costly recycling of underhoused individuals through both the medical and justice systems. Remarkably in this case the provision of such housing should satisfy both the stingy taxpayer and the do-gooder citizen alike.

Please approve this amendment to make this housing project a reality.

Sincerely,

Dan Maitland

Dear Mayor Guthrie and City Councillors,

My name is Kim Richer, and I am a community member writing in support of the zoning by-law amendment for permanent supportive housing located at 85 & 89 Willow Rd.

Our community 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 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 our whole community benefits.

I have lived in this community for over 20 years, I work here and volunteer here. I wrote a letter to the Editor when all the negatives came out on the announcing of the gift of land because I believe in "Yes In My Backyard". I believe that our neighbourhood is a great place for permanent supportive housing because of all the stores and community resources nearby. I also have a vision of many community programs being run out of such an advanced building structure (a vision that I will be actively advocating for if this project is able to go forward). I wish there were many places like this one to assist many people in their journeys. I was a young

mom of 2 children under the age of 3 when I moved into my social housing unit and I always wonder what it would have been like to move into a similar building before moving into my own place. The life skills I could have learned quicker, supportive staff assisting me in my growth, and learning about my trauma in a productive way through our agency supports rather than trying to navigate our confusing systems on my own. I 100% support this amendment going forward rather than the other building proposal for this area. The permanent supportive housing is going to be the one project that will actually be affordable to our community members. Plus, the positives that come with 24/7 staff speaks for itself. We have people in the community who cannot live on their own but we also do not want to see them so vulnerable on our streets.

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 homelessness in our community.

Sincerely,
Kim Richer

jj salmon

I am writing to object to the PSH project @ Willow Road: its mandate, development process and acceptance for a City report & Council decision in its current form. I am unable to video delegate "in person" at the 8 March meeting to due health issues & would appreciate the following questions & concerns be addressed by the City Staff/Council present.

Questions & Concerns for the Mayor/Council:

1. Why are PSH projects like this being developed, reviewed by City staff, brought before Council & even approved (120 Huron) for zoning "amendments" when applicants are actually proposing they be accepted with a whole new, undefined zoning category?

That there is an intended category for PSH is indicated in the documents, but why was *it* not developed and approved through a separate public/stakeholder input process before these projects come to council? The zoning category for PSH here and the other projects at 721 Woolwich (Parkview) and 120 Huron was literal question marks on City documents. Why are these projects being undemocratically forced through like this--it gives applicants carte blanche once they're approved to totally change the project (& the HHRA groups applying have refused to provide information & develop projects "behind the scenes")

2. Where is the public mandate from Guelph citizens, including public development and democratic, [stakeholder processes](#), for Permanent Supportive Housing, or the overall one pillar harm reduction philosophy (which doesn't include secular rehab) of which PSH is a part?

3. Why are the legitimate concerns and questions re: this & other PSH from the public & stakeholders not part of the extreme Housing/Harm Reduction Alliance being silenced or ignored?

Supportive housing, permanent or otherwise has serious documented issues of crime, garbage, needles, anti-social behaviour and public disorder in projects from [Vancouver](#) (PSH), [Nanaimo](#), [Cambridge](#) (PSH), & [Guelph](#), among others.

As someone who supports a secular 4 pillar drug strategy with social housing options, I think we need to be beyond the point where we are denying reality regarding PSH. This does not move us forward. That needs to be reflected in the way opponents are shut down at Council that relate to matters discussed, like Zoning.(the recent PSH meeting for Woolwich), denied a democratic process, & emotionally bullied by being told we're "stigmatizing" people for expressing real health/safety concerns.

For the City Staff representative(s):

Why did the City prepare a planning report on this file & recommend Council receive it, (then have staff develop a recommendation report), when:

1. There is no public stakeholder process for the planning & development for PSH/homeless policy generally or specifically on this file (including location selection) that includes [marginalized communities](#) (the disabled, LGBT, mentally/cognitively challenged, immigrants, low income, BIPOC, etc.) They are likely to be adversely affected by this, either the location, or those who are being passed up for other Fed/Prov level housing funding programs/allocations in favour of "behind the scenes" PSH applications secretly developed by religious/social activists on & off council.

2. Other projects developed or evaluated by City staff have been suspended and/or had public meetings held in response to neighbours' concerns and public outcry (including zoning issues like distance to houses, fencing, etc.) but not this PSH. City staff have responded at various points in the process, yet that hasn't happened here, despite public concern/opposition to PSH zoning (as heard at the Parkview meeting), and neighbour complaints re: process exclusion on this project.

[The “consultation” part of this staff report included only mentions the public meeting notice, & documents posted on the City’s website.]

Why are opponents of [dog parks](#)--which even had an initial public stakeholder process, given exceptional staff consideration that people--including marginalized groups, who have concerns about a project w/serious, documented health & safety concerns are not?

3. City staff have publicly stated they do not have the staffing, ability and/or expertise to evaluate PSH [projects](#) Further, according to this article that is being shifted to the County. Where is the public process for that and why are these projects being forced onto an ill-equipped staff?

Further to this point, how are they supposed to evaluate this, with no zoning guidelines? How are they supposed to assess potential for specific concerns/liabilities that are related to or ameliorated by Zoning (like location, density designation, LTA designation concerns, setbacks, amenity area definition, CPTED, specific supportive definition requirements, proximity to daycares, schools, etc.) without a relevant category?