

I am writing to express support for the County of Wellington creation of transitional housing with support components at 65 Delhi St, Guelph.

The County has conducted comprehensive analysis regarding the need for this project and shared this in community information sessions. They have taken appropriate steps to reflect community input.

The project is viable, suitable and necessary. It will become an important and vital community asset.

Thank you for sharing my expression of support with members of Council.

**Steve Howard**

Chief Executive Officer

Habitat for Humanity Guelph Wellington

Suite 100B - 104 Dawson Rd.

Guelph, ON N1H 1A6

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Joelle Rodenburgh, I am the owner of AFYA Skin and Body Clinic - a Medical Spa and Wellness center- that has been operating in Guelph since 2016 and currently resides at 55 Delhi Street. I would like to express my concerns for the proposed zoning change at 65 Delhi Street and see how we can work together for the betterment of all parties involved.

AFYA Skin and Body Clinic is an experience based Medical Spa that promotes health and wellness of the mind, body and soul. We cater to a clientele of Guelph residents that are looking to engage in treatments that will help to heal their mind and soul by creating healthy skin and body habits to support their journey. We have recently expanded into a new clinic located at 55 Delhi St. When choosing 55 Delhi, we were drawn to the relatively remote feeling of the property with quiet greenspace, limited walking traffic and neighbouring businesses that support our healthy approach to living. We love that we have balconies and green space for our clients to lounge and enjoy this beautiful city of ours. We have invested just over 2 million dollars into an 8200 square foot facility and will have a staff of 35+ Guelph residents, to provide valued experiences to our Guelph clientele. We are excited and proud of what we offer the community.

AFYA is fully in support of the need for transitional housing in Guelph and would like to stay informed and involved in any which way possible to aid the city and county in their goal to eradicate homelessness in our community. Our main concerns from the proposed plan to convert 65 Delhi Street into 36 residential lodging units, is the proximity and shared access of 55 and 65 Delhi street. The way the land is configured, when planning for 65 Delhi street, we must be cognisant that this will affect the flow of vehicular and most importantly foot traffic for both properties. The worry here is that our property will naturally become an extension of 65 Delhi street, where residents feel comfortable lounging in the parking lot and walking access paths around our building. As it is a normal expectation that a residential building would have residents participating in outdoor recreation on their property, I believe it is paramount to consider the planning of this building wisely, as to not unreasonably affect the existing business using 55 Delhi. We feel that residential zoning will not be conducive to the nature of the surrounding businesses. We want to ensure our staff and clientele feel relaxed and safe on our property. We do require that our parking lot and paths be free from anyone not engaging in the services available in 55 Delhi street. With the plan for 36 residents to move in, we feel this may be more of a challenge to maintain.

In full transparency I wish this proposal wouldn't go through, partly because my partner, who has been in community development for over 15 years, and I, believe there are much better and "bigger picture" ways of making modular homes that will better support life skills building for residents of transitional housing; and partly because having a residential building within 8 feet of our parking area and walking paths is not ideal to keep the property quiet.

So that leaves me with questions about what can be done to ensure that both buildings are properly accessible and maintain a respectful separation so both the residents of 65 and the businesses of 55 can enjoy their daily lives and this great city. If this proposal is being supported, I am requesting that a fence be built to separate the properties and that proper walking access from Eramosa be built onto 65 Delhi street. Eramosa walking access offers the best access to grocery stores, pharmacies and 2 directional public transportation. I truly appreciate your consideration in this matter and look forward to a positive outcome for everyone.

Kindest Regards,

Joelle Rodenburgh

**AFYA Skin and Body Clinic**

55 Delhi Street, Guelph ON

Below are my comments/concerns re: the rezoning proposal for 65 Delhi St.

The emergency shelter use is not explicitly removed from the revised application, like the daycare centre was. Instead, it proposes a new category (transitional housing) & a revised definition of supportive housing that is defined by the applicant (the County), with no separate zoning development process-including public input, to define them.

Per the County FAQ, Residents sign a paper that only says they are "open" to using any supports-incl. safe supply & paraphernalia. Using supports is not mandatory to stay there, nor is a commitment to go on the "housing track" forward to social housing or PSH.

In other words, if they're not required to be in a program, & can leave any time, it's effectively an emergency shelter, without any of the zoning/planning rules, like unit limits. They have also not submitted complete floor plans, so how this would work is not known. Since there's also no mention of who enforces the proposed term limit (3mos-3yrs) it's also potentially permanent housing as well.

This is not affordable housing, as both the planning application & Staff report acknowledge. It does not appear to meet the special needs designation, either. The only option re: homelessness was the emergency shelter, which was supposed to be off the table.

There is no real way for the public to see if this is compatible w/all of the planning & zoning requirements & definitions, like special needs housing because the County & the Homeless Harm Reduction Alliance (HHRA) refuse to provide info on eligibility criteria for residents, what supports there are & why needed. Also, if the supports are not mandatory, how are they necessary for daily living? How does any supportive housing differ from social housing, which allows supports for those with addiction issues, & you can't be evicted for substance use, although you can for violent, disruptive behaviour. It seems the latter is the only difference.

The City report re: OHRC concerns did not address this, especially regarding mitigation, which is done through zoning considerations like CPTED, buffers, setbacks, etc. Occupancy of accommodation is not an issue, because raising safety concerns is not the same thing as "people zoning" because it is not challenging their right to occupy the space. Any project is subject to compatibility and public safety discussion, per the planning documents, so there is no discrimination, i.e. they are not being singled out for any reason, OHRC status or not.

Others in the community who have OHRC status, like the disabled, seniors or immigrants who might be negatively affected by any public safety issues (which have been well documented in other supportive housing like the Roehampton in Toronto, the Biltmore in Vancouver, etc.) have to be considered. This area is diverse and has many people, including myself, in multiple

OHRC categories. If there are competing rights under the OHRC, then a specific accommodation process is supposed to happen.

There should be an expert third party report that considers all aspects of OHRC/Rights issues for all citizens. It appears to be being used by the City to avoid discussion of public safety & stifle dissent.

This project is not meeting the Zoning requirements, and has too many unknowns to be passed as is. It should be deferred until these are addressed.

jj salmon  
Ward one