

Committee of Adjustment

From: Lorraine Pagnan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 9:49 PM
To: Trista DiLullo; Juan DaSilva; Committee of Adjustment
Subject: 60 Ontario Street/ Application number A-26/21

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerks office,
Dear Committee of Adjustment Members,

I would like my comments included for the Committee of Adjustment meeting on Thursday May 13, 2021, with regards to 60 Ontario Street, Application number A-26/21.

I also wish to receive in the mail comments by staff and interested parties on this application. I also would like to receive by mail the decision made by the committee and any other further Variance requests, Zoning, or Official Plan notifications regarding the above property.

Below are my comments and concerns:

Currently 60 Ontario Street is a specialize C.1-15 zone, permitted uses are Vehicle Body Shop and Vehicle Service Station.

60 Ontario Street has been a colorful fixture in our neighborhood since the early 1900's. Prior to World War II it was owned by Nelson Minto as a vehicle automotive repair and gas station. Nelson Minto enlisted in World War II and then entrusted it to Bruno Borghese who ran it until sometime after the War. At some point it was sold to Arnold and Mel Wolfond and then it was acquired by the Bradburn family in 1964. It has had an addition, the concrete block end facing Ontario Street. Originally, there was a house on that portion which was moved to Oliver Street probably sometime in the 50's. But, needless to say, it has always operated as a vehicle servicing building of some sort. In the last number of years, it has been used as Bradburn's Pre-sixty's Automotive Car and Parts Clinic. Tom Bradburn's Car Clinic was well known by vintage car collectors as one of the best for parts etc., organizing tours to the States for car enthusiasts. Many in our neighborhood were sadden when Tom Bradburn passed away and the business closed. It was a part of our unique neighborhood and I feel that it is historically compatible with our neighborhood. I do not feel as the applicant is suggesting that their request would be more compatible than what is currently there. It was never a trucking operation and because of the type of business that resulted when it became a vintage car clinic it's impact for off street parking was never an issue. The bright yellow and red building adds to the character of our beloved Ward.

I feel that the variances being requested by this applicant are not minor in nature.

1. I have concerns about adding three separate uses to this site. A convenience store, barber and coffee shop will be of too great of an impact on this site and at the corner. If there is going to be a change from C.1-15 to a straight C.1 zone then it should be limited to a single use only. Three uses on this site would be too much.

2. The applicant has already taken steps into their own hands and have done preliminary work to make three separate units prior to approval of this request for the change in uses.
3. I am concerned about the idea of convenience store use . We already have a convenience store at the corner of York and Ontario, which also includes a vape store. If the proposed variances are granted this will allow for a vape store at this site . The City of Guelph does not have a Business License By-law for Vape Stores and therefore they are not currently regulated by the city and have no zoning by-law requirements, etc., as to where vape stores can be located. I don't think a Vape Store in the middle of a residential area with young children would be an ideal place, by allowing the variances with these three uses it could mean a vape shop. This is not compatible with the residential fabric surrounding this site. **Therefore, if the requested variance is allowed this should not include the use as a vape store, and should then be considered another specialized zone.**
4. The applicant is asking for a variance for parking from the required minimum of 11 down to 0. This is not minor in nature and will impact the already limited on-street parking issues on Ontario and adjacent streets. This site is not part of the C.B.D. and therefore this cannot be used as a rational to not have any parking on site.
5. My next concern is what other variances will the applicant be asking for if they get the variances for the new uses? These could include minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage, minimum front or exterior side yard, minimum side yard, minimum rear yard, planting area, off-street loading, outdoor storage, garbage, refuse storage and composters and buffer strips, rear yard, lot lines and setbacks, waste bins etc. Can the applicant currently meet these requirements?
6. The site is adjacent to a residential dwelling and the very close proximity will impact that dwelling.
7. The property is also T right at the corner of Ontario, Manitoba and Arthur Streets with very poor site lines for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed level of increased activity will be a safety issue.
8. Is this considered an impacted or contaminated site? If so what amount of clean up would be needed to allow these uses on this site?

I believe that the applicant fails the four tests for a minor variance and that what they are requesting is too intense for this site. I also feel that the applicant could provide a more compatible use by lowering the amount of uses on site to one instead of three. This would allow for the need of less off-street parking and possibly provide some on-site parking. I feel that a single use on this site would be a better fit for the neighborhood.

I look forward to seeing Bradburn's bright yellow and red building gracing our neighborhood with a compatible, welcoming use that will enhance an already amazing neighborhood.

Thank-you all for your time,
Lorraine Pagnan
Ontario Street Resident