

David MacGillivray  
[REDACTED] Guelph, Ontario  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Phone: [REDACTED]

To the City of Guelph

Re: 65 Delhi Street, Guelph Zoning By-law Amendment (the "Amendment")  
File number OZS21-004  
Submission in Opposition to the Zoning By-law Amendment

I am writing as a community member in opposition to the Amendment as currently proposed.

The safety of the community in downtown Guelph and surround area (the "Central Core Community") has diminished over time and the Amendment will serve to accelerate the decreasing safety of the Central Core Community.

I have lived in the Central Core Community for a very long time. When I initially moved to the Central Core Community, I lived on Cardigan street. At that time, I was very comfortable to walk in downtown Guelph. As a result, my wife and I bought a house blocks from downtown, in the Central Core Community and we and our three children have lived here for a number of years

Over time, the safety of the Central Core Community has diminished. I no longer feel comfortable walking downtown for myself and my family. I have had 2 vehicles stolen from my property, I found person unconscious in my front garden, I received a police notification of suspicious persons approaching children at my kid's school (King George), I have had packages stolen from my front porch, I have endured car break-ins to steal change and I have found needles found in a nearby park. Notwithstanding the many issues in the Central Core Community, we encourage our kids to get outside and play. They play hockey on our front driveway and ride bikes down the street. We walk our dog on the hill near the hospital and go sledding on that same hill in winter.

With the change that will result from the Amendment, we will be further constrained to our property and will no longer feel safe even walking in the neighbourhood. The Amendment is proposed to support intensification and use for transition housing. Research literature indicates that there is an increase in crime and violent crime within 500 feet of a transitional housing project:  
(<https://Citylimits.org/2015/02/25/after-the-shouting-do-shelters-and-supportive-housing-harm-neighborhoods/>) My family and I live within 300 feet of the proposed site that is the subject matter of the Amendment.

My preference is to build community through an educational institute like the University of Guelph or Conestoga College or better yet a small business incubator like MaRS to build sustainable, vibrant communities.

I cannot support this Amendment as a homeowner within 300 feet of this site as I do not believe this will be successful in advancing the community in the current state of this proposal. I cannot support changing the zoning if the City cannot provide a long term commitment to mixed use with in-house

support for residents so it is not just a place to temporarily place people to get them off the streets, but is a supported community. I propose a balance, mixed use. I ask that this micro community also be a mixed use to provide balance and accountability to maintain a sense of community and partnership.

I understand that the origin of this proposal is to find a permanent solution to the Loyola House Supportive Temporary Accommodation Pilot Project. This, in turn, was to move persons experiencing homelessness from the Holiday Inn Express at a cost of \$200k / month who originally came from Stepping Stones and Dwelling Place, as these locations could not support physical distancing requirements.

Is the Amendment about community building or is it about shifting persons experiencing homelessness to a new location because of cost? I worry as well that the project will lead to operation of a safe injection site across the street from where I raise my kids as the Loyola House recently received an exemption from Health Canada to operate a similar Urgent Public Health Needs Site (UPHNS), beginning in April.

Where are the counselling, job training and placement, community activities and help with life skills taking place with this building designed simply as a dormitory? If we truly want to 'community build' we need to provide the support to those who need it to actually 'transition'. Putting vulnerable people in a neighbourhood that has supports does not necessarily mean they will be used. Supports need to be not only provided but mandated and coached.

I firmly disagree with the increase in capacity from 16 to 36 as the density limitation is contained in the bylaw for a reason. By maintaining the capacity at that prescribed by the bylaw it would enable space to be freed up in this building to provide support for persons experiencing homelessness to build resilience from trauma and leverage tools and support to truly 'transition' back into the community.

As planned, this building is not setup for success for its occupants and is not setup to build sustainable communities. This building is setup to drive a need for more emergency shelters.

This is not just about a building and the grounds at this location. I propose a balance, mixed use, much as you are proposing my neighbourhood to be mixed use. I ask that this micro community also be mixed use to provide balance and accountability to maintain a sense of community and partnership within. I would ask for this proposal to critically evaluate other models of care and learn from what worked well and what didn't work well leveraging models referenced in "Housing First in Canada: Supporting Communities to End Homelessness"

<https://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/HousingFirstInCanada.pdf>. This is not just a rezoning and building project, this is a social and community building project.

I would appreciate being provided all communications respecting the Amendment and the opportunity to provide oral submissions respecting the Amendment.

Regards,

David MacGillivray

