

Dear Committee of Adjustment:

**Re: Application B-8/23 to sever 51 Hazelwood Drive**

Thank you for allowing us to share our thoughts on the proposed lot change at 51 Hazelwood Drive. We live at ■ Pintail Court and have a small percentage of our land that backs onto the new proposed lot. After reviewing the information provided, we have concerns about the proposal; specifically, regarding the potential impact on large trees within the lot, as well as those on adjacent lots. We are also concerned with conflicting information in the application.

51 Hazelwood is located across from the entrance to the Hazelwood Trail, and the significant trees on the property provide a key focal point for community residents and visitors who frequent the trail. We share concerns with many of our neighbours regarding the negative impact of removing mature trees on the lot, including for the health and well-being of those who live and visit here, as well as the potential market value of the surrounding homes.

Based on the current lot size of 51 Hazelwood, we understand that the property's trees fall under the Regulated Trees category as defined by the Private Tree Protection By-law (2010-19058). As a result, a Tree Management Plan would be required to ensure their preservation. Can the City outline the process for developing the Tree Management Plan and how residents can access or provide input into the final plan?

We are concerned about the lack of transparency in the application. It needs to be more explicit, for example, regarding the actual intended size of the proposed dwelling. The application includes a proposed dwelling that has a footprint of over 920 square meters (i.e., more 9,900 square feet, just for the first floor!). The construction of such an enormous building would require the removal of all trees on the lot, and would make it impossible to provide adequate protection for the root-zones of the many large (up to 100 feet tall) trees in adjacent lots. Given the established and growing link between exposure to trees and other elements of nature on health and well-being (e.g., see Bratman et al., 2019, Science Advances, DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aax09), this would pose meaningful risk to the surrounding community. We are further concerned that there is no actual intent to build such a large dwelling, and that the submission has simply been developed to include a proposed dwelling of the maximum-possible size to get around the need to preserve and protect regulated trees that fall within the perimeter of the proposed new construction.

The application also needs to be more explicit about the fate of the existing dwelling. The purpose states it will be retained, but the surveyor's sketch indicates it will be demolished. The absence of a garage and part of the driveway on the retained land, along with the age and condition of the dwelling, raises further questions about its future. Unfortunately, the application does not provide clear information about the intended use of the retained land or whether another severance application is anticipated. Although it is not an immediate issue, the plans for the lots will impact the neighbourhood.

We acknowledge the new owner's desire to use their property as they see fit, and we look forward to welcoming our new neighbours. We wish to ensure, however, that the corresponding changes associated with their arrival do not cause significant harm to the important, regulated trees on 51 Hazelwood Drive or the adjacent lots. More critically, we wish to avoid the negative consequences to health, wellness, and home-values that could accompany a failure to adequately protect these trees.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Karen Menard and Mark Fenske

-----

**Mark Fenske / Karen Menard**

■ Pintail Court

Guelph, ON ■■■■■■