

Re: 26 Forest St.

From: Directly across from variance request at [REDACTED] Maple St

Application Number: A-14/23, A-15/23 and A16/23

&

Application Number B-3/23 and B-4/23 5.1.2 Row 4

Minimum frontage current. 15m under Zoning R1.B on a property that is 34+M (this zoning is three properties on that side of the street, what is not shared in this proposal is that these are already the exception for the neighbourhood, zoning in the rest off the immediate neighbourhood is different at much much larger) See Zoning across the street.

Request to have 3 lots at only 11.9 would be unprecedented. See staff notes below (accept one existing grey lot between to existing houses)

Zoning across the street is in fact over 18m. Zoning R1.A-18M.

The use of street map showing properties on Maple 69 (facing Forest, small bungalow 2 bedroom), and 111,(1.5 story small home large lot)

C. Committee of Adjustments

C Builder (non resident) owner Mezcon

C. Van Harten

Dear Committee,

As the owner immediately across the road from these proposed developments, [REDACTED] Maple St, I would like to address the committee.

We (my family, multi generational: Grandma, High schooler, elementary schooler and two parents), are deeply invested in our home and neighbourhood, I write to implore you to do what is right for all of us.

This letter is in opposition to the adjustments requested as listed above. I am in a different mind than exactly a year ago, when this was before us, asking for just one mini lot. Last year (almost to the day), I went into this process on this same property, hopeful. I believed that the rules meant something for everyone, that is was about balance. Last time only one member asked questions about boundary trees. After listening to every single neighbours opposition. We were politely and not politely dismissed. This committee and city staff found out from those neighbours half way through the Hearing, that you were not getting the whole story about the property and large oil contamination on the existing property. Engineering's intervention was: simply to add a line of action to continue their support. I had thought that it was the end of a minor variance request, until the totality was understood. As it was known in advance and not included or disclosed.

Today's variance request is even more egregious and with absolutely no precedent. With Provincial rules allowing so many property options there are few things a city can do. Enforcing the bylaw and zoning is one of those things. This builder has a history of adding basement apartments (and extra on grass parking). There will be intensification while allowing some cohesion in the neighbourhood.

Below is the list provided by city staff listing previous exceptions to this bylaw you will see none look like this proposal.

Heighten by the designation across the street and the long lots well over 22m a different zone and this is just unacceptable. Nothing at 11.5 with one acceptance on a lot that was existing from the Oddfellows parking lot a grey zone. Not a lush wide property that could be easily divided to meet the bylaw. According to the map these three properties will fit on the equivalent to one across the road. But be 2X+ larger (each) and 2.5X taller. 61 Forest is a bungalow, [REDACTED] Maple is a Bungalow, 59 is a Bungalow, 77 Talbot is a 1.5 story home 1400 square feet, 16 Talbot is a bungalow, 72 Talbot is a Bungalow, 30 Forest is an Original Farm house from Harcourt farm it is the only "Tall House."

This variance is not as presented it is not as simple from 15 down to 11.5 in this R.1B Zone is 15. This is a 33+m lot with room for 2 lots at 15m in a neighbourhood surrounded by 22+m. Across the road is a different zoning 18m much larger. Surrounded by bungalows. I am not saying, no building, I am saying the right building: 2 properties thoughtful and within the zoning, green space and trees, not three small all driveway lots. The Corner of Forest and Maple, with no trees. This builder further has a history of promising to safeguard trees and not doing it. There are many calls and warnings to this. This builder consistently adds basement apartments there will be intensification, make it the right kind.

Please as you consider this proposal keep in mind the city has lots of growing to do. Paving over a downtown 100+ year old treed established neighbourhoods, is not the path or legacy. Building towers over the existing homes in the form of Mac Mansions next to 80 year old gardens and single stories, is not thoughtful. Evolving is, improving it is, think of new ways to layer in housing that is a legacy. This is not that. This is unbalanced and an abusive use of resources and relationships. Adding density can be thoughtful. Two homes is what there is room for. Clean up the oil. Build 2 homes. Layering in the lane homes and apartments that are sure to be apart of this property as this builder has a history here now.

This Committee was mislead a year ago, to meet this end. The neighbours all opposed it, we knew the first ask was to lead to this one. 2 properties can exist there, although they will be half the size of surrounding properties. The existing house from last year that was to be maintained-- was turned over to students, to wait this out. Now this builder is back with the plan to continue developing small lots, larger homes, not in keeping with the neighbourhood or the zoning of this property.

As the neighbours and citizens of this neighbourhood (this builder is not), we all knew and told this committee that the previous "minor variance" was a bad faith, first step. That there was contamination on the existing property that would require the existing house to come down.

The member of Van Harten Mr. Jeffrey E. Buisman, representing Mezcon (although the variance was submitted in the name of the previous owners G&N Kurby), said in the last severance request: the take away was neighbours "not in my back yard."

In fact it is residents who are saying: "do the right thing, be upfront, tell the truth, act in good faith." The lot as a whole is perfect for two homes that meet the standards as they are written. If we are going to pretend this is about density, add lane house to the back of the lovely lots and not more pavement. These do more for the neighbourhood, density and affordability.

I understand from the nature of the last hearing that City Staff have consistently coached this builder and in fact it was city staff who recommended the original variance request, as stated by Mr. Buisman,

in the last hearing. It is of great concern that the zoning is not being considered by staff. I hold out hope, that despite very close (personal and working) relationships between staff and this builder that this committee will do the right thing and approve only 2 houses on this property (refuse these variances as requested, they are not minor) this would be in keeping with the provincial direction and changes.

Further, I request that the city now look at the nature of the toxicity the extent not to be back here a year later. Do a water runoff study, a tree plan (none are shown on this yet many live on this property) as we lost many large old trees in the storms last summer and a traffic review.

To restate last years objection there is no, absolutely NO way this is minor in nature, good for the neighbourhood, for housing, for affordability. This is greed from a none stakeholder. Greed over Guelph.

Best
Christine Jehlicka
[REDACTED] Maple St
Guelph
[REDACTED]

I would like to speak, but will be out of the country that date and on a plane at the beginning of the meeting. I will send someone in my stead. Thank you.

I wish to know the results and get video or recording