

Dear Trista Di lullo,

This letter is from Kameron and Julie Fordyce of ■ Forest St, Guelph, ON ■■■■■, located on the west side adjacent to the property in the above application.

This is a major variance.

The proposal does not have adequate regard for the criteria under s. 51(24) of the Planning Act, including (a) matters of provincial interest, (b) prematurity and the public interest, and (f) dimensions of the proposed lots.

The proposal does not conform with or maintain the general intent and purpose of the Official Plan. Although the Official Plan permits infill, the objective of the Low Density Residential designation is to ensure that infill is compatible, and that the general character of built form in existing established residential neighbourhoods is maintained. Given that the Owners have not submitted a fulsome building design for the new dwelling, it is impossible to comprehensively evaluate the compatibility of the proposed severed lots with the established low-rise character of the Old University neighbourhood.

The Built Form policies of the Official Plan direct that new buildings proposed within older, established areas of the City are encouraged to be designed to complement the visual character and architectural/building material elements found in these areas. Absent building plans, the manner in which 3 dwellings on undersized lots will achieve these policy objectives cannot be properly evaluated. The proposal is premature until the ultimate form of development is known.

The proposal does not maintain the general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law. Although there is the potential to sever the Subject Property into two lots that comply with the zoning, the Owners have elected to provide three small lots of 11.9 m frontage. The variance to permit the reduced lot frontage does not provide for a compatible or reasonable development site for the neighbourhood.

As discussed in the previous committee of adjustment meeting for the first severance and noted by Guelph Engineering Department, other constraints exist on the Subject Property which must be comprehensively addressed through any redevelopment scheme. In particular, Environmental Site Assessments should be completed so that any soil remediation requirements are secured through consent conditions.

The proposal is not minor in nature. The proposal will have unacceptable adverse impact on the street and surrounding properties, through the removal of mature trees and vegetation, and the construction of 3 dwellings on undersized lots. This is particularly impactful to ■ Forest Street, given its relationship to the Subject Property. ■ Forest Street is a shallow lot that has a more square configuration. Its side yard functions as a rear yard. The proposal would locate a dwelling 1.5 m from the property line. The proposed lot and dwelling footprint would create an unacceptable adverse impact of a planning nature. The anticipated tree impacts are also extremely important to Mr. and Ms. Fordyce given the function of their side as an extension of their rear yard. If the lot is severed into 2 reasonable parcels that conform to the current aesthetic of the neighbourhood a reasonable buffer for the trees on our property line could be created.

Regards,

Kam and Julie Fordyce