

To Council, City of Guelph,

As residents and homeowners in the City of Guelph we have reviewed the Staff Report and associated documents involving proposed 'intensification of density' to include four units, rather than the 3 which the Province has proposed. We have a number of questions we would like addressed.

1. As the proposal seems to be based on and motivated by "funding" promised by the Federal Government, is the City of Guelph 'guaranteed' this funding will be made available to them, considering an election may be coming sometime in the next year? What is the timeline offered for this funding? Who is receiving this funding? What will this funding be spent on? What risk will the City of Guelph be exposed to should this funding not materialize, or stipulations and conditions be changed in the meantime? This is a financial question that is extremely concerning to all tax paying residents of Guelph.
2. How is 'affordable housing' being provided through this proposal? By eliminating a lot of regulation, it only makes EVERY low density property MORE valuable due to the 'anything goes' approach to developing the lands. We agree with concerns stated by those who had the opportunity to attend public consultations, that this may very well give wealthy developers and builders an advantage over those who may want to purchase property for their own single residential use. The proposal seems to push the elimination of regulatory processes and zoning protections which has the potential to have a negative impact on neighborhoods, completely changing their character. The opportunity to make money on multiple dwellings then becomes the priority here (many rental units are being the norm), RATHER THEN potential home owners, and the health and flourishing of neighborhood communities.
3. When and where were 'notices' given for any of the public meetings mentioned in this report? One statement says another meeting was 'cancelled' due to lack of attendance. We would note that it is difficult to attend a meeting if sufficient notice is not given to those affected. The report states some people were actually 'invited' to these meetings and what criteria was used to determine who got the invites? We would suggest that as the report seems to know exactly how many low density properties could be affected directly by this proposal, why did the City of Guelph not see fit to provide letters to all land/home owners in these areas? This affects all of us and all should have been advised of this meeting in a tangible and documented way.
4. Why are communities/neighborhoods that are most affected by these changes, and specifically the nature and character of these communities not so much as mentioned in this report? People in our neighborhood have invested their lives in many cases, in purchasing, maintaining and enjoying where they live for decades and this is true in most established neighborhoods, low density or not. The emotional, financial and social investments are REAL ,yet they have not been addressed anywhere in this report. To ignore such an important factor in developing policy for this City is extremely disappointing, misguided and insensitive. Our councillors are elected to inform the City of Guelph of the concerns of their residents. Developers seem to be the priority in this proposal,

and tax paying, land owning residents of Guelph should also have an equal opportunity to be heard and their interests considered at the table. How much land in the City of Guelph is currently 'undeveloped' and owned and held onto by Developers or the City of Guelph itself? Why is this land not being focused on for 'affordable housing'? Before opening the door(as this proposal seems to suggest) to allowing more intensification with less regulation within established neighborhoods, undeveloped land should be offered to provide needed housing.

5. Who benefits from this proposal? Yes, housing has been a problem for a long time and if we had a Federal government that recognised that, perhaps they would have paid some attention to their immigration policies which do not plan for such increases in population by looking forward..do we have enough housing? Do we have enough jobs? Because of this lack of foresight we now are scrambling to provide housing, but please tell us how fourplexes solve this problem? Who will be made to sacrifice for the benefit of the developer's interests?
6. How does this proposal impact the environment? No real facts, research or input can be found in this proposal. Yet the idea of 'environmental' quality, so called carbon footprint and tree canopy seem to be buzzwords in Guelph, but this report does not place any priority in keeping greenspace. People used to come to Guelph because of its blessing of more open spaces and we should NOT sacrifice the proven benefits that greenspace, bird habitat and tree canopy provide. Increasing development on already developed land takes away from all of this. What research has staff done on the impact of 'intensification of density'? How does it benefit people, families and neighborhoods and the environment?
7. Please provide detailed information regarding a By Law currently under appeal as mentioned in this report. Will the appeal be decided before the planned vote on this proposal in June 2024? Please provide 'predictable outcomes' that this proposal, if approved, would provide.
8. Considering all of these items, it is our opinion that this report is insufficient in that potential homeowners' concerns are not mentioned. Also the consideration of various impacts such as: environment, social, traffic, property values, noise and beyond need to be included in such a report. Without this information and the assurance of 'promised' federal funding, caution should be first and foremost.
9. A vote on this proposal would be premature until these concerns have been explored, and/or addressed.

Sincerely, Dennis and Marlene Mortley, Guelph