

Trista Di Lullo, ACST

Feb 28, 2023

Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

Guelph, On

Application # B-3/23, B-4/23, A-14/23, A-15/23, A-16/23 **26 Forrest St**

Hello and Good Afternoon.

I am writing in response to the above applications currently before the Committee of Adjustment for 26 Forest St.

We have lived on the southwest section of the subject property as shown on the Van Harten plan. Lot 6. ■ Maple Street for the last 27 years. As you can guess, we are quite familiar with the subject property and the neighbourhood. We have seen many changes in the neighbourhood over the years and are not against change but, strongly oppose these applications.

As I am sure the committee is aware this is the second time in two years the owner of the property is requesting changes to the property. My guess is due to the environmental issues on the property the existing building has to be removed to accommodate the environmental cleanup. If you have to remove the building you might as well go for broke and get as much out of the property as you can.

I could go through all the water runoff, tree canopy, noise, student rental, traffic, parking etc. issues but the committee have heard them all last year. I am sure it is still fresh in their mind and don't need to be reminded.

Now, these applications before the committee have been suggested as a minor variance. What is considered a minor variance? (**"If a proposed change doesn't conform exactly to the zoning by-law, but follows its general intent"**) Apparently, last May it was going from the minimum zoning by-law of 15m frontage to 13m frontage for one lot on the property. Now we are looking at 11.9 meter frontage for three lots on the same property. If there is 1.5 meters space on each side of the home this would make it a mere 8.9 meter wide house x 3. Is this still a minor variance? I think not, as these applications do not follow the zoning by-laws general intent. Is this a positive and appropriate development for the neighbourhood? We all know the answer to that....NO!

As I said before we are not opposed to change but it has to be reasonable for the property and neighbourhood. Let's look at what would be positive and appropriate for the property/neighbourhood.

As the building on the property has to be removed for environmental cleanup and the full property frontage is almost 36 meters, the property can simply be divided in half and no variance required for frontage. This would ultimately be the best scenario for all involved. It would keep the integrity of the neighbourhood and would allow the developer to double their money.

In conclusion, we are vehemently opposed to these applications as they stand but would be receptive to dividing the property in two equal parts.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and trust you have the City and its Neighbourhoods best interest in mind.

Cliff and Lynn Arcand