

Hi Ryan,

I am writing you today to input my concern over the conversion/consideration of 14 Stevenson Street from low density housing to medium density housing. While I support development of this property, I do not support the current medium density, 10 unit design proposed.

Myself and other residents have expressed concern over the proposed design for the property. Among several factors (mentioned in the initial consultation), in my opinion one of the main consideration relates to safety of nearby residents due to an oversight of minimal parking allocated to the design and size. I understand the developer has "slightly" exceeded the mandatory minimum parking required by the City of Guelph. While I understand there is a minimum threshold set out by the city, I suggest it would be misguided to believe it will be sufficient and functional without consequential impacts to surrounding areas. In smaller density development, the overflow parking is easier absorb bulky the surrounding area.

My concern this larger 10 unit development that will push the overflow parking to the next options. Included in this is Grove St. At the present time, Grove street supports the current local needs of the street. The concern of additional longterm parking to occur on Grove Street will create reduced parking for local residents and added traffic to a street that currently has no side walks on the lower half of the street. Local residents tend to understand and respect speeds and safety and sub-sequentially drive appropriate speeds through this area. Empirical based evidence reveals the problematic safety concerns or folks that are not from the street. Additional traffic and parking will add to the safety hazards especially of people walking, exercising, etc. while not utilized by myself, Grove street is a point of interest for many fitness enthusiast that use the "100 steps" stairs and grove as a continuous loop.

I whole heartedly believe 14 Stevenson St is not an appropriate location to build the currently proposed 10 unit dwelling. I believe something perhaps smaller and within the realm of the current low density land use would be much better suited for this site.

After the consultation in the summer with the developer, consultants and yourself, it was mentioned that there would be follow up information and answers to some outstanding questions. Emails were provided but no response has been provided. It is small omissions like this that have further concerns for the responsibility and interest of the developer and team.

Please strongly consider the impacts of the current design to the local neighbor and taking safety as a priority.

Please reach out if you have questions or wish to discuss.